The Dissertation Committee for David Luis Glisch-Sánchez Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

"Listen to what your jotería is saying": Pain, Social Harm, and Queer Latin@s

Committee:

Sharmila Rudrappa, Supervisor

Néstor Rodríguez

Sheldon Ekland-Olson

Ben Carrington

Susana Peña

“Listen to what your jotería is saying”: Pain, Social Harm, and Queer Latin@s

by

David Luis Glisch-Sánchez, B.S.; M.PUB.POL.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2015

Dedication

To those Brown Queer Souls whose pain is not seen, heard, or understood; this has always been for you.

Acknowledgements

A person does not and cannot complete a dissertation and Ph.D. program on their own. There are the obvious ways this is true: your teachers, dissertation committee, advisor, and sources of financial support. Beyond this however, there is a constellation of folks that you rely on and help you in so many unexpected but wonderfully kind ways. So, please allow me to indulge in the wonderful practice of acknowledging this long list of beautiful people and souls who have played an instrumental role in helping me, whether they realize it or not.

My gratitude will always begin with the twenty-six TLGBQ Latin@s I interviewed who through their courage, vulnerability, kindness, and generosity entrusted me with their life stories and the knowledge, wisdom, pain, love, fear, and hope that was contained within. Thank you for all of the hours you spent talking with me. Thank you for taking a chance on a total stranger. Thank you for being you and sharing that with me. Although their presence in the dissertation is not as visible, I would also like to thank the seventeen stakeholder interviewees who volunteered their time and insights to talk with me and provide extremely useful contextual knowledge I would not have had otherwise.

There are several organizations and institutions I must thank. I am grateful for the financial support I received from the Hogg Foundation for Mental Health through their Harry E. and Bernice M. Moore Dissertation Fellowship program, UT-Austin's Community Engagement Center, and the Department of Latina/Latino Studies (LLS) at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) who provided not just financial support but was a critical intellectual incubator for this project. Within LLS, I would like to especially thank Laura Castañeda and Alicia Rodríguez who provided constant support

and encouragement. Additionally, I am grateful to my LLS colleagues Sandra Ruiz, Alberto Brandariz-Nuñez, Julie Dowling, Jonathan Inda, Claudia Sandoval, and Ana Soltero-Lopez for the tremendous kindness and intellectual engagement they have provided. I am forever indebted to Allison Holladay in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at UIUC for the administrative support she gave, her professionalism and promptness was always extremely appreciated. I must thank the students in my class, LLS 396/GWS 395: Latin@ Genders & Sexualities, who made it a joy to come to class every week despite the stress of finishing this dissertation. So to these nine wonderfully brilliant human beings—Lisette Arzuaga, Bobi Benegas, LaDarius DuPree, Araceli Medrano, Ellie Morales, Kaitlin Penn, Sruthi Raman, Xavy Ramirez, and Flor Reza—thank you for being an oasis during such a crazy time.

I am indebted to several community organizations/projects that supplied intellectual and spiritual inspiration that gave me the courage to blaze my own trail and remain grounded in a liberatory ethics and politics. These spaces and places are Alexis Pauline Gumbs' Eternal Summer of the Black Feminist Mind, especially the Brilliance Remastered program and the Guardian Dead: Ancestor-Led Intellectual Practice retreat. Dr. Gumbs along with Guardian Dead co-facilitator Eric Darnell Pritchard and retreat participants have all taught me how to do this work without comprising our vision for justice and transformation. Dr. Ruth Nicole Brown and all the black girl geniuses of Saving Our Lives, Hear Our Truths (SOLHOT) have taught me the joy that comes with celebrating the brilliance and wisdom of black girls, Latina girls, and all girls of color. I thank Brilliance Remastered and SOLHOT for inspiring me to be a better person.

This project would not have been possible without the various kinds of help and support I received from community organizations like the Esperanza Center for Peace and Justice, South Dallas Cultural Center, Anti-Violence Project of New York, Audre

Lorde Project (especially, their Safe OUTside the System Collective), Make the Road New York, and the James Weldon Johnson Institute for the Study of Race and Difference. These organizations provided literal space for interviews or group meetings, a sounding board for ideas and observations, and/or insights into the local communities I was entering and attempting to work in. A very special recognition must be given to Priscilla Hale, Dr. Rose Pulliam, and all those that comprise the allgo community. You have given so much feedback, support, and many opportunities to share my work to a wider audience. Thank you so very, very much!

I have had many teachers during my long academic journey, all of which have helped me learn important lessons and gain essential knowledge, but there are some in particular I must recognize. Thank you Paul Gessner for giving a precocious, loud, and opinionated queer cubanito license to be themself even when they didn't always know what that meant. Gratitude does not begin to describe what I feel towards Shirley Minga, who for me is the embodiment of teaching excellence. Thank you for demanding the best from me and never allowing me to be intellectually lazy. Thank you for being a fair teacher who saw *all* of their students; you are the kind of teacher every child deserves and should have. Thank you Mr. Guardalabene for introducing a 16 year-old me to this thing called sociology and Dr. Enilda Delgado who gave me the first idea at 21 that maybe I would want to pursue a Ph.D. in sociology. Dr. Kara Lindaman is *the* reason I made it through the trials and tribulations of my undergraduate institution; she was a mentor and confidante *par excellence*.

This project and its line of inquiry began many years ago in a graduate seminar on Queer of Color Theory at the University of Michigan, thank you so much Larry La Fountain-Stokes for introducing me to a body of literature that felt like safety and home. Your class and mentorship launched me onto a path I am so grateful for. Thank you Mary

Corcoran for giving me the space to study public policy in a way that felt organic and true to me. Thank you Anthony S. Chen for taking me through my first two graduate sociology courses and giving me the opportunity to do archival research for the first time. Your encouragement and model teaching and research have left an important impression.

During my tenure as a doctoral student, there has been a community of scholars who have so generously supported and encouraged me in a myriad of ways. It is hard to explain just how important support, kindness, and encouragement are to completing this process, but these folks provided it in spades: Jossianna Arroyo, Deborah Paredez, Frank Guridy, Stacy Macias, Rod Ferguson, and Deb Vargas. I want to thank Peter Ward, whose qualitative methods course demystified the research process for me, and gave me the confidence and belief that I could do this. In addition to this community of advanced and senior scholars, has been the intimate community of graduate school colleagues who have been like a second family to me. They have loved me, provided feedback, given advice, and been just really incredible people. So, with this said thank you so very much Jessica Dunning-Lozano, Sergio Cabrera, Aída Ramos, Claude Bonazzo, Elvia Mendoza, Esther Sullivan, and Andrea Henderson-Platt. Your courage, intelligence, kindness, and love have been life sustaining.

I must take a moment and acknowledge the fellow dissertators who completed their projects and programs during my year at UIUC. It was a delight to be a witness to Delicia Greene, Durell Callier (Dr. D), and Kyle Mays Wabinaw becoming doctors. You energized and inspired me at a very critical moment!

I must thank my family of origin and ancestral guardian dead. To Tata, Tío Fernando, Tía Esmi, Uncle Ed, y todos mis prim@s, especially Luis Mejia, Angela Mejia, and Isaac Glisch, thank you for your unconditional love and support in all of the obvious and not so obvious ways. Thank you for being a safe harbor in a world that is all

too often cruel and mean. The depth of my gratitude for your presence in my life is infinite. Along with these wonderful people still with me, has been a legion of guardian angels, some who transitioned to this role during my doctoral process. I have felt their presence, wisdom, and protection throughout this journey. I name my guardian dead/angels here and send them in return the Light and Love they so generously shared with me: my abuelita (Carmen Sanchez), my abuelito (Luis Sanchez Gay), my great grandma (Ethel Kulwicki), my suegra (Kitty Pritchard), Nena (Irene Blanco, neé Sanchez), Coco (Manuel Blanco), Tía Rosita (Rosa Sanchez), Tío Ondin (Rolando Sanchez), Tía Mercedes (Mercedes Sanchez), and my primo Nelson.

To my family of choice, you have sustained me and saved my life, you are a pure manifestation of love and joy in my life. Thank you for helping me see this project through to the end and helping complete this chapter of my life. There are too many to name, but let me especially recognize: Jennifer Wilks, Meta DuEwa Jones, Nadia Omar, Tina-Marie Walters, Tanya Perkins, Erica Allen-Little, Milton Little, Stephanie Keene, Reagan Jackson, Tenisha Hudson, Shameka Erby, Toni Guy, Ebony Hunter (neé Alston), Chinwe Newton (neé Eneh), and Gwen Pough. In falling in love with my partner, I was blessed to also inherit an incredible "in-law" family. The amount of love and acceptance they have brought into my life cannot be measured. As many know the Pritchard family is large, so please know that I love and adore all of you, but let me take a moment to especially recognize: my mother-in-law/guardian angel Kitty Pritchard (thank you for allowing me to be your fourth son and for being my mother); Aunt Bunnie (Bernadine Washington); Avery Pritchard; Stacey Pritchard; and my nieces and nephews, Tajanei "Taj" Pritchard, Avery "AJ" Pritchard, Jr., Corey Pritchard, Laila Pritchard, and Tiana Pritchard.

In comprising my dissertation committee I had two rules: ask those scholars who would make the project the very best it could be *and* who are models for the kind of person/colleague I would like to be and emulate. Sharmila Rudrappa (chair), Néstor Rodríguez, Sheldon Ekland-Olson, Ben Carrington, and Susana Peña easily met and far exceeded my wildest dreams. To say that Susana Peña is brilliant and generous is an understatement, she is the dream external reader, bringing her prodigious talents and knowledge to bear on this project, her mentorship has been invaluable. Thank you, Susana for bringing your generous and enlightening spirit to this project. Both in class and in the committee, Ben Carrington has pushed me to read ever more widely and held me up to a rigorous standard that has made me a much better researcher and scholar. He is tough but ever an advocate for his students to be the best; thank you, Ben. I have had the great opportunity to learn from Sheldon Ekland-Olson as both a scholar and teacher. His humility, sense of humor, intelligence, and kindness are all things I aspire towards. Thank you, Sheldon for being such a great model. Néstor Rodríguez represents the very best the academy has to offer: wisdom, an open mind, and unconditional kindness. He gave me my first opportunity to focus my intellectual inquiry solely on Latin@s during an independent study, one of my favorite graduate school experiences. Thank you, Néstor for allowing me to be me, pushing me here and there, but above all, always being a listening ear and mentor.

There are many things I could say about Sharmila Rudrappa, how she is a genius, how she is the ideal advisor through the firm yet flexible guidance she always provides, her complete honesty, and many, many more things. Sharmila, however, has the rarest of traits in academia: she sees her students for the whole human beings we are. Yes, we are students, we are researchers, but she also understands that we are someone's child, parent, partner, sibling, friend, etc. Life happens when we are on this doctoral journey,

hard things, tragic things, joyous things happen on the road to the Ph.D. Through it all she has been there encouraging, pushing, and advocating for me. She always respected the vision I had for this project and set out to support me in seeing it through. I pray I can be as good of an advisor to someone else as she has been to me. She has made me a much better scholar, but an even better person. Thank you, Sharmila, for all that you are and all that you do. It never once was taken for granted and has always been extremely appreciated.

Last, but certainly not least, I must express my deepest gratitude to my partner of ten years, Eric Darnell Pritchard. He has been my rock, my harbor, my cheerleader, and my everything through this process. He has been patient and generous. You saw a way forward on this journey to earning my Ph.D. when at times I did not see it. Your faith and love in me has literally been a lifesaver. No degree, no accomplishment, no award or accolade has or ever will compare to the Light you have brought into my life. You and Sharmila are the two pillars that have sustained me in this process. Thank you, thank you, thank you for being your perfect, kind, brilliant, genius, patient, amazing self and helping me realize this dream. Eric had a little help in the form of a small and spoiled Shih Tzu, our dog-child, Madison Sanchez-Pritchard. I thank Madison for his funny faces, his cuddly ways, and his sweet puppy kisses that instantly took the stress away from any situation. With Eric and Madison, I am easily one of the luckiest and most blessed people in the world.

"Listen to what your jotería is saying": Pain, Social Harm, and Queer Latin@s

David Luis Glisch-Sánchez, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2015

Supervisor: Sharmila Rudrappa

In this dissertation, I investigate how transgender, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer (TLGBQ) Latin@s have experienced social harm during the late 20th and early 21st centuries, what is the socio-historical context for their experiences, and how have ideologies of Latin@ gender and sexuality shaped these experiences. This is accomplished through the analysis of twenty-six (26) life story interviews where TLGBQ Latin@s provide a testimonio account of their encounters with social harm. Using a *social harm* framework and centering markers of pain, I develop the theoretical concept *algorithms of pain* to understand the dynamic and complex experiences TLGBQ Latin@s have with harm rooted in the everyday and institutional realities of racial, gender, sexual, and class inequalities. Algorithms of pain asserts that the totality of social harm TLGBQ Latin@s encounter shapes the meaning they assign to any individual harmful event, informs evaluations of pain and potential harm, and structures daily behavior and attitudes. Algorithms of pain reveal the myriad of ways TLGBQ Latin@s can and do express, communicate, and narrate pain; thus, countering the dominant presumption that pain manifests and is communicated in very narrow terms. This is exemplified in what I have observed as *racial utterances*, where

TLGBQ Latin@s narrate in ways that make use of silence, brief remarks, or stories in passing as ways to index racial social harm, instead of stories thick with detail, description and explicit accounts of pain. Additionally, algorithms of pain establish the centrality of racism, patriarchy, transmisogyny, homophobia, class exploitation, and xenophobia to constructing the full spectrum of emotions that represent pain. Lastly, the dissertation documents through an analysis of governmental mission statements why the state is unable to intervene into the social harm effecting TLGBQ Latin@ lives. The state represents the institutionalization of an algorithm of pain that privileges whiteness, cisgenderness, heterosexuality, wealth, and citizenship, which results in *harm management* being the overall orientation and function of the state in social harm.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION: TLGBQ Latin@s, Social Harm, and Complex Personhood

> That life is complicated may seem a banal expression of the obvious, but it is nonetheless a profound theoretical statement—perhaps the most important theoretical statement of our time. Yet despite the best intentions of sociologists and other social analysts, this theoretical statement has not been grasped in its widest significance.
> --Avery F. Gordon, *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*

Reading these words by sociologist Avery Gordon for the first time felt both liberating and challenging, creating a somewhat volatile mix of excitement and fear. Excitement at feeling the permission to conduct research and intellectual labor that was at ease with complexity and contradiction. Fear stemming from the questions of how one goes about doing this. The epigraph above and the Gloria Anzaldúa (1987) quote—"listen to what your jotería is saying" (p. 85)—that serves as the title for this dissertation, are my roadmap on how to get there. "Life is complex" represents a utopic destination for any sociological theory because complexity necessarily refers to and incorporates contradictions: logic and emotion; love and fear; vengeance and forgiveness; clarity and ambiguity; explanations and unanswered questions. Gordon's remarks fuels my desire to produce a theoretical framework that is worthy of the totality of transgender, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer (TLGBQ)[1] Latin@[2] life in the United States; one that honors the presence of individual agency and social domination, realizes TLGBQ Latin@s both resist and reproduce the very ideologies and practices that cause them pain, and finally does not reduce TLGBQ Latin@ life to a litany of suffering but recognizes the joy, healing, and love that also permeates their life stories.

Anzaldúa's comment contains inflections of authority, anger, desperation, and confidence. These elements become clearer when we observe the statement in context

> Colored homosexuals have more knowledge of other cultures; have always been at the forefront (although sometimes in the closet) of all liberation struggles in this country; have suffered more injustices and have survived them despite all odds. Chicanos need to acknowledge the political and artistic contributions of their queer. People, listen to what your jotería is saying. (p. 85, 1987).

Anzaldúa argues, and I concur, that TLGBQ Latin@s and other queer people of color, have many critical and important things to say and contribute, beyond even what they have already done and said. She stipulates that we can only acknowledge this through the act of listening. What is listening, then, to the sociologist? Listening, as Anzaldúa presents it, reflects a specific relationship between the researcher and participants. Listening requires the practice of ceding authority to respondents; in believing their social observations and analysis in the telling of their life stories are credible in understanding the social phenomenon under investigation.

The central question guiding this investigation is: how do Latin@ TLGBQ people experience social harm during the late 20th and early 21st centuries? Supplementing and underpinning the primary question are three interrelated secondary queries that guide the design and analysis of the project:

1. What meanings do Latin@ TLGBQ people give to their experiences of social harm?
2. What is the socio-historical context for how Latin@ TLGBQ people experience social harm?
3. How do Latin@ gender and sexual ideologies and practices condition the experience of social harm?

Stating that TLGBQ Latin@s experience tremendous amounts of social harm as a result of white supremacy, heteropatriarchy, transmisogyny, capitalism, and xenophobia may be obvious to many. Despite the obviousness of this statement, little scholarly labor has been brought to bear on this problem to understand this reality with the eventual

hopes of changing it. Answering the aforementioned questions represents a substantial first step towards rectifying the invisibility of TLGBQ Latin@s and social harm, and builds upon the work of pioneers in the sociological investigation of Latin@ sexualities (Acosta 2013, Almaguer 1991, Argüellos & Rivero 1993, Asencio 2010, Cantú, Jr. 2009, Garcia 2012, González-López 2005, Peña 2013).

If we understand any form of social harm, prevalent in a multitude of social spaces, as an ethical and moral failure, then we must consider why it is tolerated, and most often outright supported and propagated. I argue this tolerance for social harm is because mainstream, dominant epistemologies are unable to name it. There is a hegemonic ideology of harm that is operating and fundamentally states that harm is not only acceptable, but is good and beneficial. I have come to recognize this ideology is epitomized at the micro-sociological level in the saying "no pain, no gain." The pain, discomfort, and hurt that attends harm is coded as "dues paying," "earning your way," "rite of passage," etc. At the macro-sociological level, this dominant ideology can be found in the neoliberal public policy principle of "personal responsibility," which has been a key component of major legislative acts; most notably the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (Welfare Reform) and the Personal Responsibility Education Programs under the Affordable Care Act of 2010. The concept of personal responsibility within public policy states that a narrow set of circumstances exist as to when the state will intervene and ensure the public's general welfare, and outside of these specific conditions individuals and communities are on their own. Whether the micro- or macro-level, this results in harm, and social harm in particular, being normalized and rendered unnoticed.

The invisibility of social harm affecting TLGBQ Latin@s is achieved despite their best efforts to resist this imposed silence. Through social media, cultural production,

and grassroots activism TLGBQ Latin@ individuals and communities have given voice to the pain and suffering they are subjected to on a daily basis. Notwithstanding these efforts, no systematic plan has been developed and deployed to intervene, prevent, and ultimately eliminate all forms of social harm constricting TLGBQ Latin@ life in the United States. This points again to an epistemological blind spot within and outside of the academy. As Ferguson (2004, p. ix) explains, "epistemology is an economy of information privileged and information excluded, and that subject formations arise out of this economy." Thus, the current dominant economy of information does not privilege expressions of queer Latin@ pain and suffering leading most often to apathetic and passive responses to TLGBQ Latin@ experiences of social harm. Through grounded analysis of TLGBQ Latin@ life stories, I observe a phenomenon I term *algorithms of pain,* which re-centers queer Latin@ life and experience to the sociologies of race/ ethnicity, gender, sexuality, and emotion.

SOCIAL HARM: RECASTING AN OLD PROBLEM WITHIN A NEW PARADIGM

Violence, rape, harassment, abuse, discrimination, prejudice, and neglect; these are just some of the names given to what is often considered different forms of harm. But what if the person experiencing them does not see them as different? Legal codes categorize harm in hierarchical ways. Federal and state penal, anti-discrimination, and regulatory statutes, and the very study of crime, deviance, discrimination, and prejudice, affirm the perceived differences between various manifestations of harm. To be sure, harm does occur in many forms. Likewise the diversity with which harm appears does portend important differences between these various forms, and indeed these differences should be (and are being) observed, catalogued, and understood. However, despite the diversity of its many forms, the various manifestations of harm produce and reproduce

similar emotional, psychological, and even spiritual experiences, including rage, anger, sadness, fear, frustration, despair, and loneliness. Therefore, harm has an emotional, psychic, and spiritual life that is not simply tethered to the temporal and spatial moment wherein it occurs. This is not to say that all people feel the same way about a given harmful event, or even that an individual will always feel the same way about a particular harm; rather, the *experience* or *feeling* of harm across its many forms results in shared meanings that breaks down in practice the socio-legal divisions of harm.

This observation raises several important and challenging questions. First, what is the impact then to our sociological understanding of harm if we expand our analytical gaze to include the entirety of experiences of a person's lifetime? How might a particular form of harm take on a particular resonance based on the other sorts of harm an individual has experienced in their life? How might our understanding of institutions be radically altered through an analysis of harm as it manifests and is experienced throughout the life of human beings?

Social harm provides a robust framework to answer these questions and arrive at an overall understanding of TLGBQ Latin@ pain stemming from the social inequalities that inundate U.S. society. The first articulations of a social harm frame were from European and British criminologists, from whom I draw inspiration. Hillyard et al. (2004) says that "a social harm approach is [designed] to move beyond the narrow confines of criminology with its focus on harms defined by whether or not they constitute a crime, to focus on all of the different types of harms, which people experience during their life course…it makes no sense to separate out harms, which can be defined as criminal, from all other types of harm. All forms of harm we argue must be considered and analysed together" (p. 1-2). Hillyard and Tombs (2004) sketch out seven defining tenets of a social harm paradigm. These include: 1) physical harms (most in common with traditional

criminology, but also includes accidental death, disease and illness, and homelessness); 2) financial/economic harms (poverty and various property and cash losses); 3) emotional/psychological harms; 4) cultural safety (autonomy, development, cultural/intellectual/informational resources); 5) inquiry (partially) defined by people's understandings, attitudes, and perceptions; 6) comparison of harm across time (cradle to grave); and 7) shift from emphasis on individual blame to collective responsibility.

Hillyard and Tomb's tenets of social harm have been extremely helpful for my project. They, along with many Latina queer feminists, in particular Gloria Anzaldúa, provided the space to free my imagination from ontological and epistemological handcuffs that I wasn't aware I had. My use and development of the concept *social harm* is borne from the challenge to create a bridge between the life stories my research participants shared and the academic-legal paradigms within which I am immersed. *Social harm* is an idea birthed in *nepantla*[3], the socio-spiritual in-between space Gloria Anzaldúa (2002) wrote so often about. An intellectual, and even spiritual, space where one, if only for a brief moment, leaves the "safety" of their certainties and embraces the potential knowledge, wisdom, and clarity wrought from the tension and conflict created when two or more worlds border one another. Social harm represents my best effort to remain faithful to the life stories shared with me, while attempting to make the narratives and the details contained therein with all of their complexity and depth legible to audiences. Therefore, social harm operates as a sort of shorthand for all the types of violence a human being encounters during their life as a result of the systemic social inequalities that occur around the axes of race, ethnicity, sexuality, gender, class, nationality, ability, and religion/spirituality.

White supremacy, patriarchy, heterosexism, homophobia, transphobia, classism, ableism, and xenophobia are all systems of social inequality and domination that operate

around axes of identities (white supremacy is race/ethnicity, patriarchy is gender), but rely heavily upon other identities and their attendant systems of subordination. These systems of inequality have material effects on the distribution of economic, political, social, and emotional resources. The convergence of all these systems of inequality create and maintain a vast catalogue and network of privileges for Western, elite, white, cisgender, heterosexual, able-bodied men; most important of which is safety. Other human beings, depending on the matrix of marginalized or privileged identities they inhabit or are ascribed, have provisional or liminal access to privilege.

Social harm, therefore, represents the universe of institutional, collective, and individual actions and inactions that create and maintain inequalities based upon race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, class, nationality, ability, and religion/spirituality. This universe of actions includes prejudice, discrimination, harassment, assault, sexual violence, abuse, neglect, ostracism, and disregard. The inaction that I mention speaks to the withholding of intervention or alleviation into the individual and collective suffering we witness as individuals, groups, institutions, and societies. Social harm is not only a collection of racist or heteropatriarchal practices, but also the ideologies that authorize such practices, which is a form of harm in and of itself. Unlike Hillyard and his cohort, I anchor social harm explicitly to the various systems of social inequality that constrain TLGBQ Latin@ life. I do this because anything less would be inadequate to the intellectual task of understanding TLGBQ Latin@ experiences and merely recreate and maintain the very social practices harming my participants. Therefore, in my conceptualization, a liberatory ethic forms the cornerstone of social harm and operates much in the same vein as the central directive of the medical community's Hippocratic Oath: first, do no harm! I understand and acknowledge that social harm as currently explained remains a little fuzzy and unclear in its exact boundaries, but this only

represents the first major articulation of this framework. The fullness of this concept and framework will continually be explored in future publications and works.

The lexicological root of social harm is the word "harm," which represents the impact the various forms of action and inaction research participants say that affect them negatively. TLGBQ Latin@ narratives often contain the hallmarks of harm: expressions of pain ranging from anger, rage, and frustration to sadness, fear, and suffering. I do recognize these are not the only hallmarks, that absolute silence can also be a hallmark of harm, especially in the most traumatic experiences like the Jewish holocaust or Japanese internment (Laub 1992, Nagata & Cheng 2003). There are forms of harm that do resist all efforts to render them visible and knowable, but this should not preclude us from pursuing what we are able to know. The definitions of socio-legal terms such as discrimination, hate crime, rape, and abuse, are debated endlessly in legal, political, and academic arenas. Although not entirely immune to these same recriminations, the identification and recognition of harm through these characteristic features helps sidestep this issue to some degree and achieves what Iganski (2008) refers to as a "victim-centred approach" (p. 117).

Each individual moment of social harm is assigned or given meaning and significance. However, the meanings and significance of events are interdependent and co-constitutive with other social harm events. The hallmarks of social harm that I referred to earlier—pain, anger, sadness, fear, suffering, etc.—can be thought of as the cement or adhesive that connects these events separated by space and/or time. Therefore an individual person, a lesbian Latina for example, can experience a host of social harm events separated by time and/or place during the regular course of her life, but not experience it as individual singular events. This point is critical, because it indicates an understanding that these seemingly individual events result by being situated in social

contexts hostile to her very existence. Additionally, social harm provide a critical lens for an individual to connect separate events in their life and draw meaning from them; in addition, the concept of social harm allows individuals to connect the details of their life story with someone else's life story. As a result, social harm becomes a way by which to speak of events that are collectively encountered.

It is important to stipulate that social harm does not reflect a simple aggregation of individual events; rather, it refers to the inter-relatedness of these sorts of individual exclusions and elisions that shape and mold individual and group experiences of pain, which I call *algorithms of pain* wherein the constitutive elements are transformed (i.e. experienced) as something altogether different. In other words, social harm incidents represent individual data points for TLGBQ Latin@s, the subsequent experience of other social harm (i.e. as their data sample increases) simultaneously has an impact on the experience of the social world they are embedded in. This does not mean that Latin@ TLGBQ people all share the same world-view, however observing the themes contained through all or most of the collected life stories provides powerful evidence of the social dynamics shaping the lives of so many TLGBQ Latin@s, namely the controlling systems of white supremacy, patriarchy, homophobia, transphobia, classism, ableism, and xenophobia.

The benefit of social harm as a conceptual framework is two-fold. First, it represents a more holistic rendering of how TLGBQ Latin@s encounter, experience, and ultimately make meaning of harmful events. The communication of an accurate rendering is critical not just because it helps us better understand the problem being investigated, but also it actually increases the possibility for, what Cathy Cohen (2012) terms, radical empathy. The ability, and maybe even the willingness, to enter and imagine the life of another, especially across multiple borders of difference is the essence

of radical empathy. It is my understanding that it is quite rare, maybe impossible, to engage in radical empathy without, at the very least, some important signposts that provide critical information in our entering and imagining another's life. If we have inaccurate signposts or information the imagining we endeavor in runs the very high risk of being very inaccurate and ultimately recreating the same social inequalities radical empathy is designed to counteract. Second, social harm as representative of the totality of racist, patriarchal, homophobic, transphobic, xenophobic, classist, and ableist harm that permeates our social world provides powerful evidence for the need of simultaneous systemic change. To do anything less is to sign onto the complicity of causing the suffering of others. The framework of social harm incorporates intersectionality (Combahee River Collective 1983, Crenshaw 1991) as a cornerstone feature, which motivates the impulse to hold all constitutive elements in TLGBQ Latin@ lives together to render legible the totality of pain and suffering.

A Note on "Hate Crimes"

The idea for this study initially grew from an interest in hate crimes; both in terms of the micro-sociological dynamics producing such violence, but also the ways the law understands and attempts to address it.[4] 'Hate crime' is the dominant socio-legal term we have to identify, discuss, analyze, and ultimately prosecute the social phenomenon that occurs at the intersection of identities and violence. As a political project, the development of 'hate crime' has been hard won as a category of violence that is invested with acknowledging the role of hegemonic ideologies—white supremacy, patriarchy, transmisogyny, heterosexism, xenophobia—in producing and authoring interpersonal violence. Despite this hard won victory, a hegemonic discourse about social harm exists and produces a normative and universal 'hate crime' or 'bias-motivated' event. It's

normative because it establishes a narrow set of standards that all social harm events must meet in order to be considered a 'hate crime.' It's universal because it is assumed that all social harm occurs in the way 'hate crime' is described and discussed. As a result, this dominant normative and universal discourse 1) assumes how identities are being used and what their role is in the actual event, and 2) narrowly defines who the aggressors or perpetrators of this form of social harm are. The mechanisms through which this discourse is developed, maintained and promulgated are the obvious: elected officials, investigators, prosecutors, and journalists (Herek, 1992; Iganski, 2008; Perry, 2005). To that list I would add social movement organizations and scholars. Therefore, when people refer to 'hate crimes,' they are often talking about this discursively produced category and not the totality of social harm in its many variations and permutations. Scholarly research is all too often reliant upon the culturally, politically, and legally derived category of 'hate crime.' It is this predisposition I argue we must resist with greater consistency and efficacy.

The law necessarily constructs a normative and universal definition of 'hate crime' and limits the political possibilities of how to address and prevent social harm. This would appear somewhat counterintuitive since many have observed the wide variation in legal definitions and standards of 'hate crime' within federal and state statutes (Bennett, Nolan & Conti 2009, Hall 2005, Henry 2009). I agree that the language found between and within numerous penal codes constitutes "wide variation" in legal terms. However, when operationalized and put into practice they only capture a specific portion of all social harm. Thus, practically and sociologically speaking federal and state statutes are consistent and narrow in their identification of social harm. The consistency and narrowness in application of federal and state 'hate crime' statutes is exacerbated by the adoption of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's *Hate Crime Data Collection*

Guidelines (1999) by local law enforcement agencies. For example, within the FBI's guidelines specific markers of space and time have become relatively important to the identification of 'hate crimes.' Within their schema, 'hate crimes' are more readily identifiable when they take place in gay neighborhoods or business districts, religiously affiliated properties, or neighborhoods in demographic transition (Ibid.). Time is considered a major signifier if the violence occurs during a holiday or date that bears some significant meaning to a particular racial, religious, sexual, ethnic, or disabled group (Ibid.). Criteria or guidelines do not operate unidirectionally; their presence in a given event affirms a 'hate crime' designation, but their absence, I argue, provides an equivalent negation to being labeled a 'hate crime.'

I stress the problematic practices and ideas underlying socio-legal uses of 'hate crime' because it is within this academic, legal, and practitioner literature where I believe social harm and this project's use of social harm can have one of its greatest and most important interventions. My articulation of social harm in some sense is the fusion of 'hate crime' scholars' willingness and desire to discuss and analyze identity and systems of subordination with the expansiveness and victim-centered approach of social harm researchers. This project has as one of its goals the desire to translate the knowledge and wisdom gained into practical and applicable lessons that displaces the state's *harm management* ideology and practice that has also found a home in some criminological and sociological scholarship.

JOT@ DIALOGUES: A GROUNDED METHOD FOR UNDERSTANDING TLGBQ LATIN@ PAIN

The research design for this project is based in life story analysis to produce a grounded theory to understand TLGBQ Latin@ experiences of social harm. Life history as a research design has a long history within American sociology (Anderson 1923,

Becker 1970, Bogdan 1974, Chambliss 1972, Cornwell and Sutherland 1937, Dollard 1949, Goodson 1980-81, Klockars 1975, Plummer 1983, Ritchie 1996, Shaw 1930, Thomas and Znaniecki 1918-1921, Thrasher 1927, Wirth 1928, Zorbaugh 1929). The methodological design for this project is simultaneously rooted in the Latin American tradition of *testimonio* (testimony), a form of life story meant to provide a witness account of personal experiences, often about trauma, with the expressed purpose of connecting these events to larger socio-political practices (Gugelberger & Kearney 1991, Latina Feminist Group 2001, Ojermark 2007, Yúdice 1991). Although there does not always exist a neat boundary between life history analysis and other research designs, life histories at their core reflect the use of first-person biographical narratives to identify and understand larger social dynamics.

There are several general benefits of life history analysis. First, life histories, through the first-person narrative, illuminate the meaning individuals place on a variety of social situations and relations. The first-person narrative can take a number of forms, including life story interviews, oral histories, diary entries, memoir, and autobiography. The life story interviews are "more than a recital of events. It is an organization of experience. In relating the elements of experience to each other and to the present telling, the teller asserts meanings" (Rosenwald and Ochberg 1992, p. 8). The thick detail and subsequent meanings that result from life story interviews make it a uniquely helpful technique to answer the specific questions I am posing in this project. The central structure of a life story account—the retelling and narration of episodes in an individual's life—produces extremely helpful data that not only aids our understanding of what a TLGBQ Latin@ person has gone through, but illuminates simultaneous seemingly ancillary topics that the participant understands to be related. These topics can be other people, antecedent events, ideologies, and discursive practices. The life story provides

markers and evidence of the contextualizing socio-historical dynamics that frame queer Latin@ encounters with social harm. Robert Atkinson's (1998) description of life story provides a helpful summation of the meaning-making benefits

> a life story is the story a person chooses to tell about the life [they have] lived, told as completely and honestly as possible, what is remembered of it, and what the teller wants others to know of it…As a way of meaning making, identifying life influences, and interpreting experience, there may be no better method than the subjective narrative of the life story to help the researcher understand a life from the insider's point of view. (Pg. 8, 13)

In other words, life stories are a means through which the researcher can best capture the connections and relationships individuals see between obvious or seemingly disparate experiences, social actors, and institutions. Importantly, if done correctly, this method can provide a bulwark against a researcher importing their own biases into the meanings and understandings of participants' assertions and observations. This does not mean a scholar cannot search for some of the deeper, and less obvious, meanings and connections a participant makes either consciously, subconsciously, or unconsciously, but it does require a level of accountability between the researcher and project participants, it is this latter effort that we have termed data analysis. With regards to this project, the primary aim is not to develop a catalog that factually establishes every instance of social harm queer Latin@s encounter; rather, I am interested in *how* queer Latin@s experience social harm. The use of "how" is deliberate because it places emphasis on perceptions, meaning making, and interpretation. Since this method and design is especially good at eliciting this kind of information from interviewees, it is apparent then why it is the optimal choice for this study.

Time is a variable that most forms of sociological research struggle to measure and account for; understandably a longitudinal panel study is the gold standard for attempting to capture changes over time. Unfortunately, longitudinal, and in particular

panel, studies generally require extensive resources, not least of which is having the time to wait for subsequent data collection. Despite this challenge, Ilze Arielle Matiss (2001) succinctly emphasizes the importance of time to the research process and the nature of lived human experience when she writes "research, and indeed life itself, is comprised of layer upon layer of interconnected moments in time…Our stories are ever changing and evolving" (p. 223, 227). Although longitudinal research can be prohibitive in its cost and logistics, it is important for sociological research to capture the effect of time, or more importantly observe the interdependent relationship past events have on future experiences, and vice versa. Life history is an example of a cross-sectional research design and method that attempts to do this, which is the second general benefit of life history that is of particular concern to this study. Life history appreciates the importance of time and the changes that occur therein and can have the ability of approximating, with limitations, the characteristics and qualities of a longitudinal study (Matiss 2001; Babbie 2004).

Time is a critical dimension of the relationship between two or more events. Whether one event precedes, is concurrent with, or follows another illuminates potential co-constitutive properties each has in the meaning, significance, and impact of the other. Additionally, the prominence of social fixtures, in particular institutions, increases and decreases throughout different stages of a person's life. The best example of this is schools, K-12 and beyond, which play a far greater role in the lives of young people than older adults. Since the social topography of an individual is partly dependent upon which life stage they are in, choosing a research method and developing an interview instrument that organizes information into specific periods of time helps identify likely socio-institutional entities within their environment. In Appendix A, you will notice that most of the major sections of the interview guide for Latin@ TLGBQ participants are

organized into several major periods: childhood (0-11), adolescence (12-18), young adulthood (19-29), adulthood (30-50), and later adulthood (51+). I recognize that many of the delineations between different periods, particularly those from young to later adulthood, are somewhat arbitrary, and may not have any particular significance to many of my participants. The guide is organized in such a way so as to provide some form of temporal scaffolding for interviewees to organize their narrative; however, I recognize that many people do not construct narratives in a strict linear fashion. As a result, at the beginning of the interview, I always explained and emphasized that it is not imperative that participants follow a strict linear format and that the structure was more for me to make sure I was asking all of the appropriate questions. Thus, during interviewing, participants were not prevented from relating one story to another just because it was not technically located within that specific time period.

The third and final general benefit of life history design for the purposes of this study, is its ability to ground individual experience in there personal history. In the process of constructing their narrative through a life story interview, participants will point to and highlight numerous social elements and dynamics. For example, Joey Sanchez[5], a participant, relayed how a former boyfriend was physically abusive that culminated in an incident where he was stabbed several times. Up until the time of being stabbed Joey did not involve the local police, instead opting for the local municipality's mental health office since Joey's boyfriend was diagnosed with bipolar disorder. Joey was adamant in not wanting to involve the police because of his general distrust of them stemming in large part to his two years of incarceration in county jail. What is important to observe, even though Joey never does in his retelling of events, is that the mental health agency took no formal steps to stop and/or prevent further abuse from befalling Joey. Although there is no clear evidence, to which I am privy to, that explains why the

agency did not take action, I am left wondering what role did Joey's ethnoracial, class, and sexual identities play in the construction of the social conditions of his life that allowed for the violence and abuse to continue. I provide this short retelling of Joey Sanchez's story to highlight the way a participant socio-historically grounds their narrative both directly (Joey's expressed distrust of police) and indirectly (the uncommented inaction of the mental health agency).

Life history, as an overall research design, can ascertain the socio-historical context of an individual's or group's experiences beyond the evidence and clues provided in a life story account. In this project, I am using two other techniques to triangulate the socio-historical topography of my queer Latin@ participants: stakeholder interviews and government documents. The stakeholders I refer to are individuals who are representatives and/or members of organizations and agencies who work on issues related to violence in queer and/or Latin@/people of color communities, or who are tasked in general with addressing interpersonal violence. Appendix B contains a copy of the interview guide that was used with these individuals. Interviewing representatives of these agencies and organizations aid in constructing a fuller picture of the socio-discursive spaces Latin@ queers move in and out of. I analyze government documents to isolate the state's overarching ideology and practices surrounding social harm. Documents range from executive branch departmental mission statements agency reports and manuals to court decisions and statutory language.

Recruitment Strategies

Recruitment of TLGBQ Latin@s was conducted through the use of formal and informal social networks. Formal networks included membership directories and electronic listservs maintained by community organizations, this also includes posting

fliers or posters in offices or facilities these organizations maintain. The text of electronic and physical fliers is identical and includes a brief description of the project, its purpose and my contact information for those who are interested and would like further information. The text is located in Appendix C. Informal social networks refers to word-of-mouth recommendations or distribution of electronic or physical fliers by friends, acquaintances, and colleagues throughout Texas. I also placed fliers in public locations and venues that are high-traffic centers, such as community centers, clinics, and cultural centers. The recruitment language used in informal social networks and public venues recruitment is the same as formal network recruitment.

There are basic eligibility requirements that people had to satisfy in order to qualify as participants. First, a person must be of Latin American descent and identify as transgender, lesbian, gay, bisexual or queer. Secondly, a person must be at least 18 years of age and currently living in the state of Texas. I chose to exclude minors from this study because of the difficulty of obtaining parental consent, especially with the very real possibility that their parents or family are a source of social harm in their life. Texas has been selected as a site for the project for obvious reasons, it is a central location for the history of Latin@s in the United States and has a large TLGBQ Latin@ population. Thirdly, if a person is an immigrant, then to be eligible they must be living in the U.S. for five years or more. Since the project focuses on queer Latin@ experiences in the U.S., it is important that immigrant participants have enough time in the U.S. to catalog an array of different life experiences that will add to the breadth and depth of the queer Latin@ experiences captured in the study. Additionally, the "therapeutic" language that is often used in life story interviewing around social harm is culturally situated and may not be readily accessible to newly arrived immigrants from countries of origin where this is not a norm. None of this is meant to imply newly arrived immigrants do not have profoundly

important observations about social harm in the U.S., but that the methodological design of this study is not best suited to collect this information. Admittedly, five years is a bit of an arbitrary time horizon to impose; however, other studies make use of the same criterion (González-López 2005). Lastly, potential participants had to have experienced violence or some type of harm because of who they are. This has been the most difficult question to craft given the delicate balance I desired to strike between being open and honest with participants about the kind of conversation we were going to have, but avoid the use of language that might cause potential interviewees to erroneously believe they are ineligible.

Life story participants received a $25.00 VISA gift card to compensate them for the time they give to complete the interview. When I conducted a pilot study in New York, I did not have funds to acquire gift cards, and as a result all five of my participants were college educated, some with advanced training. As a result, I made it a priority to secure funds to purchase the gift cards. The end result was a significantly more economically diverse group of TLGBQ Latin@s as compared to the pilot study.

In the end, I was able to recruit twenty-six TLGBQ Latin@s for life story interviews. They ranged in ages from eighteen to sixty-seven years old; just over half were under the age of 29, thus there was a slight bias towards younger participants. The clear majority (21) of participants were of Mexican-descent, with Cuban, Puerto Rican, and Venezuelan-descendancy representing the rest. Unfortunately, no Afro-Latin@s volunteered to be interviewed, thus they are not represented within this study.[6] Additionally, no immigrants were interviewed; many TLGBQ participants are second-generation, and one participant even lived in Mexico for two years, but all were born in the United States and had U.S. citizenship. Fifteen participants were cisgender, while six self-identified as genderqueer, and five others as transgender. In terms of diversity in

sexual identity, the break down is as follows: 11 gay men, 9 lesbian/queer women, 3 queer genderqueer people, 2 heterosexuals, and 1 "other."

Interview Protocol

Both life story and stakeholder interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed afterwards. Length of life story interviews varied widely from just over an hour[7] to just over four hours; the stakeholder interviews on average lasted seventy-five minutes. Interviewees had the choice as to where they were interviewed in order for them to have control over the place in which they shared their narrative, if for no other reason so they could feel comfortable in order to retell some potentially difficult moments in their life. If it was logistically impossible for the participant and I to meet in person we talked via Skype. No phone interviews were conducted for life story participants.

As mentioned previously, the bulk of the interview was segmented into several life periods beginning in childhood then, adolescence, young adulthood, adulthood, and later adulthood. Obviously, depending on the age of the participant not all sections were covered. What should be noticed (see Appendix A) is the deliberate posing of questions that seek to understand the positive and affirming moments and spaces in TLGBQ Latin@ lives. This decision was made because many people often do not recognize the harm, abuse, and violence they experience as such, they have been socialized to view it as normal and tolerable, if not outright acceptable. Therefore, asking participants about the good moments and places in their lives serves as a metaphysical photonegative image of those areas that are not safe and harm-free. By observing who, where, and what makes them feel affirmed, I can then make notice of what is absent in these accounts. For example, a queer Latina may talk about encounters with her mother where she felt the most loved or affirmed, but makes no mention of father or siblings even though they are

in her life. The absence of father and siblings from her narrative account of affirmation and safety could suggest that at the very least they play no significant role in creating safety and validation in her life or at worst are a direct threat or obstacle to having those things in her life.

There are several similarities in the design of the interview guide for stakeholder participants versus the life story guide. Like with Latin@ TLGBQ participants, I ask stakeholder interviewees relevant biographical information and their views and ideas around violence and hate crimes. I ask stakeholder participants to compare the beliefs and definitions that they share with me to the beliefs and definitions used by the public at large, the organization/agency they are a part of, and the police department and district attorney's office. These questions are designed to cast the widest net to capture the prevailing norms and ideologies around violence and hate crimes. Since I am talking with stakeholder participants because of their relationship to a specific organization and agency, I do have a brief section of questions that asks them to describe their role in the agency or organization they are a part of while also describing the organization's mission and constituent base.

Data Analysis

The transcriptions of interviews, both life story and stakeholder, along with the government documents shall be analyzed using a content analysis method using HyperResearch 3.0 (HR3). HR3 is a qualitative research analysis software package that allows researchers to conduct a content analysis. To be clear, the software does not conduct the analysis for the researcher, but allows what was done manually now to be conducted electronically. This allows for greater and faster access to hundreds, even thousands, of source materials simultaneously. My overall strategy for analyzing data is

to develop a grounded theoretical explanation by following the well-established guidelines and procedures developed since the late sixties (Charmaz 2006, Glaser 1978, Glaser and Strauss 1967, Strauss and Corbin 1990). I followed a hierarchical coding structure and conducted a first round of analysis applying mid-level[8] codes, such as "sibling conflict," "stranger conflict," and "police conflict." Once these broader categories were applied to the data I began identifying specific and more narrowly defined social dynamics beneath these broader themes in order to begin the construction of a nuanced theoretical framework. I would add that using HR3 and the coding structure I utilize makes possible the ability to conduct comparative analysis between different subsets of participants interviewed. One such useful comparative analysis would be between the youngest and oldest participants, capturing any differences in experiences of social harm, which would be helpful given the historically rooted nature of various manifestations of social harm. This specific comparison, among other possibilities—Latina lesbians and Latino gay men, or trans* and cisgender Latin@s—was not pursued in the dissertation, but represents a line of inquiry that will be pursued in the future.

DISSERTATION OVERVIEW

Animating the entire dissertation is social harm as an analytical category to capture the complete array of ways systems of social inequality affect TLGBQ Latin@ communities. Each subsequent chapter is designed to enhance our ability to rigorously investigate social harm events in the lives of queer Latin@ people, while eschewing long held assumptions to produce new knowledges.

Chapter 1 introduces and develops the primary theoretical contribution of this project: *algorithms of pain*. The chapter explains how pain is organized in TLGBQ Latin@ lives and in turn how that pain organizes individual and collective TLGBQ

Latin@ life. . The purpose of this chapter is to develop a tool that enables the recognition of the myriad forms by which TLGBQ Latin@s represent their pain. The chapter forwards the argument that the experience of pain must be understood in order to comprehend TLGBQ Latin@ experiences of social harm and the meaning they assign to it. Grounded in the sociology of emotion, critical race theory, and Anzaldúa's concept of *la facultad*, algorithms of pain ultimately moves us towards a sociology of pain.

To clarify, social harm is the term I use to capture the continuum of violences TLGBQ Latin@s encounter stemming from systems of subordination; ranging from epistemic violence, inaction or refused intervention, and isolation to verbal harassment, discrimination, sexual assault, and murder. Algorithms of pain is the term I employ to describe the individual, collective, and institutional processes of constructing the experience of pain by TLGBQ Latin@s that are integral to the practices of meaning making they use in relation to the social harm they experience. Thus, the accumulation of social harm experiences results in particular algorithms of pain.

All subsequent chapters build upon the initial articulation of algorithms of pain in the first chapter. Chapter 2 focuses on state social harm by outlining *harm management* as the prevailing social harm ideology and practice that governs the state's action and inaction. I argue that harm management represents the institutionalization of an algorithm of pain that is sensitive to and prioritizes the pain of the most privileged, and thus is antithetical and antagonistic to TLGBQ Latin@ algorithms of pain.

Chapter 3 interrogates the relative de-emphasis of racialized pain within TLGBQ Latin@ narratives of social harm. I argue this should not be interpreted as an absence of racial social harm, but a consequence of particular factors shaping queer Latin@ algorithms of pain. I introduce the concept of *racial utterance* as way to make visible and bring into relief the presence of racialized pain within life stories where it seems to be

thoroughly or temporarily absent. I also propose two social factors that often correlate with the utilization of racial utterances by TLGBQ Latin@ participants.

Chapter 4 focuses on social harm within the family context, but in ways that lie outside of the common narratives of social harm within by TLGBQ people in relation to the family. This chapter ultimately represents an interrogation of commonly held notions about the family that render many forms of social harm invisible. I focus on racial social harm within the family, and children who practice social harm towards their queer parent.

In the Conclusion, I provide a final outline for my argument regarding the centrality of pain to the understanding of social harm but also as the key to social transformation. Additionally, I summarize the overall contribution of this project to the discipline of sociology, while detailing potential real-world applications of the lessons learned and point towards next steps in the study of TLGBQ Latin@ experiences of pain and social harm.

CHAPTER 1 - Algorithms of Pain: A Rubric for Understanding Queer Latin@ Suffering

My objective at the beginning of my project was simple: I wanted to understand the experiences that transgender, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer Latin@s have with social harm. I utilize the concept of social harm because it gives me the analytical freedom to engage participants' experiences of pain, suffering, trauma, sadness, anxiety, anger, and rage without being tethered to strict legal and academic categories like hate crime, rape, child abuse, and bullying among others. Utilizing social harm also provides the autonomy to take on the related topics of safety, healing, forgiveness, and justice when talking about people's experiences with violence and trauma; areas that often receive short shrift in studies about crime victimization or identity-based discrimination and violence. What seems so obvious now, but frankly was not apparent for me at the beginning was the fact that emotions and feelings were the key to decoding sociological events and dynamics within the lives of TLGBQ Latin@s. By understanding how my participants are deploying and signifying feelings and emotions in their first-person narratives I am able to glean important insights into the social mechanics of white supremacy, transmisogyny, heterosexism, patriarchy, capitalism, and xenophobia. In other words, just like physicists or other natural science researchers who study the tidal movements of large bodies of water to capture information about both the Earth and Moon's mass and gravity, and the interactional forces of the two, among many other things; so too can we learn about systems of oppression through the experience of individual and collective emotions and the social interactions, norms, and practices that produce them.

It would first be beneficial to provide the definition of emotions that informs this study. Unfortunately, no universal definition of emotion exists within the sociological literature. Even amongst those sociologists who specialize in emotions, their definitions are greatly influenced by the initial assumptions they make about the nature of emotions, which is usually a function of what school of thought they align with. For cultural theorists a difference is drawn between biological emotions and social sentiments, where the latter is understood as "a socially constructed pattern of sensations, expressive gestures, and cultural meanings organized around a relationship to a social object, usually another person" (Gordon 1981, p. 566). Maybe more succinct, are affect control theorists who simply define emotions as those cultural labels we apply to feelings we have in response to an event (Smith-Lovin 1990). For still others, like Robert A. Thamm (2007), emotions are "defined as the process of actors appraising and responding to real or imagined focused social situations" (p. 16); for Thamm, appraisal is a cognitive process that results in physiological responses. It is not that these definitions are mutually exclusive of one another, but they tend to place an emphasis on particular elements. Gordon's definition stresses (understandably) the social dimension of emotions but simultaneously draws a hard distinction between the social dimension and neuro-cognitive processes that shape the construction and experience of emotions. Thamm's desire to create a taxonomic system to identify all distinct human emotions results in a focus on cognition, because of the consistency in the application of rules in cognitive processes. I find affect control theorists the most flexible in their definition; however even their conceptualization assumes the need for emotions, or feelings for that matter (a distinction they draw but I do not), to occur necessarily on a fully conscious level.

Drawing on these schools of thought, I offer the following definition of emotions: Emotions are information; they represent a means by which individuals and groups

perceive and evaluate the environment around them. They are an embodied way of knowing, in part because emotions often, although not always, trigger physiological reactions that can take the form of bodily sensation. For example, when we are nervous we often feel our pulse race or palms become sweaty. However, emotions do not always conform to traditional sensations or tactile experiences; it is in this situation where people often use less concrete descriptors, such as "they gave me bad energy" or "their presence lightened the mood." Comments such as these are quite common and indicate humans experience emotions in ways that produce embodied feelings but in ways that lie outside customary lexicological systems. I argue such statements reflect the subconscious and/or unconscious dimensions of emotions because although they have a "generalized feeling" they are unable to clearly articulate its source and meaning. Even greater evidence of the subconscious and unconscious nature of emotion is the panic attack. Acute levels of stress often trigger panic attacks; at times the source of stress is obvious and known, yet many times people say they had no idea they were under such a degree of stress that would result in such a drastic physiological response. Therefore, a panic attack in some sense is a mechanism through which the body is attempting to bring conscious attention to emotions that are trying to communicate some information. What information are emotions attempting to communicate? The answer is a great deal, but it all can be summarized by a single question: is what has occurred, is occurring, or will occur helpful, harmful, or neutral in its impact on me/us? Emotions revolve around an axis of positive and negative valences (Kemper 1978, Russell 1980, Thamm 2007, Wiener 1980), and it is the specificity of the lexicological label we apply to the emotion that helps identify the source, type, and depth of positivity or negativity (e.g. dread vs. sadness, joy vs. contentment).

The complexity of emotions arises out of the reaction rooted in physiological, cognitive, and social processes. Human evaluations of social dynamics do not have to necessarily occur on the conscious level of cognition. As a result, the identification and experience of pain transpires on all levels of consciousness, thus our method must be sensitive to this reality. Surprisingly, pain is very rarely studied in the sociology of emotions; the one major exception is the experience of pain as it relates to health. Bendelow and Williams (1995, 1998) note that definitions of pain must necessarily broaden from current Cartesian premises that root pain primarily as a physical sensation resulting from some form of neurophysiologic pathology. This cannot be stressed enough, although it may seem commonsensical, *the condition of pain does not necessitate a physical sensation, especially of varying degrees of discomfort*. By extension, pain does not only exist when it is consciously recognized as such.

For now, I offer the following working definition for both *pain* and *algorithms of pain* that I will subsequently explain. All negative emotions, thus pain, are evaluations of circumstances whereby an action or inaction represents an attempt to diminish an individual's humanity (see Table 1.1 on following page). This holds true for socially unacceptable emotions like jealousy, which can be understood as a form of pain stemming from a person's determination of self-lack (i.e. accolades, awards, promotions, wealth, power, sexual partners, etc.) that is experienced as a form of commentary on their value and worth.

The basic idea behind *algorithms of pain* is that every individual has an internalized formula that structures their experiences of social harm and evaluations of pain, and relatedly safety. These formulas shape the degree, depth, breadth, and kind of pain that an individual experiences in a given harmful event and moment in daily life. These algorithms are vast, complex, and dynamic because they represent a lifetime of

learning and meaning making. My description here is not meant to imply that these algorithms of pain are a conscious process or rational; rather, a person's algorithm of pain is simultaneously conscious, subconscious, and unconscious. Norms, scripts, roles, and expectations structure algorithms of pain in large part but not exclusively. Algorithms of pain, as a theoretical framework, recognize the agency and autonomy of individuals and does not reduce the individual to a collection and accumulation of social experiences.

Table 1.1: Emotions Constituting Pain

PAIN		
Agony	Embarrassment	Overwhelmed
Alienation	Fear	Panic
Ambivalence	Flustered	Pity
Anger	Frustration	Rage
Animosity	Grief	Regret
Anxiety	Guarded	Rejection
Apathetic	Guilt	Remorse
Apprehension	Helplessness	Resentment
Bitter	Horror	Restless
Contempt	Impatient	Sadness
Depression	Irritation	Shame
Despair	Isolation	Shock
Devastated	Jealousy	Suspicious
Disappointment	Lost	Terror
Discouragement	Melancholy	Torment
Disgust	Miserable	Vengefulness
Distress	Mistrust	Weary
Dread	Nervousness	Worry

I came to understand TLGBQ Latin@ suffering and encounters with social harm through my interview with Nadia Abbasi. Her life story, for me, provided a lens to interpret other interviews I had already conducted. It was late on a Tuesday morning when I met Nadia Abbasi at her friend's home. We had connected through one of my Tumblr announcements. At the beginning of our conversation, Nadia describes herself as

a “brown” skin, “queer” person who politically identifies as a “Chicano lesbian.” Nadia is “gender queer” and prefers “they” as a pronoun but does not mind “she” (hence my use of the feminine pronoun). Nadia is “Chicana of Middle Eastern descent”[9] that grew up in a Texas border town and lives there at the time we met. She spent a short period of time in a city in the U.S. Pacific Northwest. It was during this time when Nadia explored her gender identity and expression. Although Nadia self-identifies as a gender queer person, she also identifies as a “woman of color.” Nadia realizes that often she is ascribed the identity of “woman” despite her gender non-conforming self-presentation, especially since she is petite and slender in body shape and has stopped taking testosterone for some time. Nadia is twenty-four and has taken several semesters of college classes but is not enrolled when we talk. To financially support herself, Nadia helps a friend run a café in their hometown. Nadia does not desire to work and manage the café in perpetuity; instead she aspires to become a midwife for women of color.

After asking Nadia basic questions about her background and language she uses to describe herself and her immediate family, I ask questions about her early childhood (birth to 11 years old). Towards the end of our conversation about her early childhood I say to Nadia

> **David:** Okay. So, that’s sort of the last question that I have about your very early childhood. Is there anything – I guess around safety, violence, harm, or affirmation, joy – about that early part that we haven’t talked about that you think it would be important for me to know?
>
> **Nadia:** Yeah, one thing. Okay, I guess there’s two things. I guess when I was also about five or six, an older female cousin stayed with us, and she’s actually abused me. And it was only over the course of one summer, but it was still a pretty big deal, ‘cause it was learning that my body wasn’t gonna be respected as my own. Which set up bad paths for the rest of my life.

And when I was 11, in 6th grade, I was in P.E., and I said some bitchy comment to some other little boy or something, and he came up from behind me and knocked me onto my knees and started throttling me almost until I passed out. And that was the first time I had experienced physical violence on my body outside of the familial context. And I felt that I did the right thing; I went to the principal. I filled out all of this stuff, but all it took was one other little boy saying, "She was asking for it; she was baiting him," and he got off. You know? Like he didn't have to do ISS; he didn't have to do any detention, like any of that.

And it was like – it also set up bad patterns of behavior because it was like I went outside of my shell and risked talking to adults about it, even though I knew that I might be setting myself up for further violence. And again, my experience was invalidated, and my voice wasn't listened to, especially in contrast relation to two white males. You know?

David: So, it was a white male that did this to you?

Nadia: Yes.

David: Okay. The cousin who abused you, how much older was she?

Nadia: Just a couple of years.

David: Just a couple of years?

Nadia: Mm-hmm.

David: And did you ever tell anybody?

Nadia: No, and I still haven't. She died when she was 15 because of an anorexia-related stroke. So, I don't really want to – I don't know, like I don't think it would be useful for me to tell my family that she was a sexual abuser. There's not really anything you can do about it. You know?

David: Yeah. Do you wish that you could have told somebody?

Nadia: I don't think – I think I gauged properly as a child that the response would have been bad if I –

[A CAT KNOCKS OVER SOME STUFF AND MAKES A LOUD NOISE]

Nadia: Okay. It's probably cool, don't worry about it. No, I'm pretty sure that if I had spoken to my family about it as a child, like things would have

really sucked for me. So, I don't know, I feel like even as a five-year-old or six-year-old, I properly gauged what I was supposed to do.

David: Okay. Based upon the circumstances that were there?

Nadia: Yeah.

David: Okay. In an ideal world, do you wish you could have? If things were better, do you wish you would have been able to say something?

Nadia: Yes, absolutely.

Sexual violence during childhood was not a universal experience amongst the TLGBQ Latin@s I talked with, but unfortunately, neither was it uncommon. The very first comments are informative: Nadia qualifies the period of the sexual abuse as "only" being for a summer, implying that it could have been longer and thus worse. The word "only" is not often understood as a word indicative of feeling or emotion, but in this context it is. "Only" represents an attempt to contain and possibly minimize the experience of pain through the specter of the alternative possibility of sexual abuse that could have continued for much longer. However, it would be a mistake to conclude that Nadia's use of "only" is an attempt at containment or minimization entirely on their part for their benefit because she asserts that despite this seemingly short period of abuse, the impact is "a pretty big deal." It is such a "big deal," that Nadia identifies this experience as foundational to the lesson that her "body wasn't gonna be respected as my own."

Nadia's testimonio provides evidence of a powerful social dynamic that illustrates the presence of the dominant ideology of harm tenet to minimize pain. Her use of "only" is meant to represent the external gaze of this dominant logic; it betrays a very real observation and understanding that Nadia has that in retrospect, since the abuse lasted for one summer, many people would say or conclude at least it stopped and did not continue. For Nadia, it does not matter that it occurred for what some may say was a short period of time somehow making it qualitatively better than if it happened for a longer interval; that

it occurred at all is the source of pain for Nadia. Additionally, Nadia experiences pain through the expectation that they were supposed to remain silent; this expectation is confirmed relating to a different harmful event when a male classmate assaulted her, and nothing is done to address this breach of social harm. Nadia is constructing meaning about the social harm she experienced; she roots the threats to her bodily integrity as a child to the social norms and practices of patriarchy and white supremacy, the bodies of young Chicana-Middle Eastern girls are not imbued with full subjectivity but instead are objects for scorn and pleasure. The emotions and feelings interwoven in Nadia's narrative reveals the breadth and depth of her sociological knowledge as it pertains to social harm and pain.

Later in our conversation while discussing Nadia's adolescent years, she discloses that she experienced two other sexually violent social harm events in her life. Both of these were single events, unlike the experience with her cousin, but both perpetrators were cisgender men. When Nadia was seventeen and traveling with her immediate family to see extended family in their country of origin in the Middle East she was raped by a male cousin. The most recent sexual violence Nadia encountered was just a year and a half before our meeting. The perpetrator was a white cisgender man who Nadia considered a friend. She provided me with a sobering summation of the long-term impact of sexual violence and patriarchal social harm on her social behavior and maneuvering in a world filled with potential threats:

> **Nadia:** […]And beyond that, it just makes me feel extremely unsafe around cis[10] dudes, like even your coming over, I figured you were probably queer, and so that's some degree of safety to me, but whenever a cis male approaches me on the street, even if it's just asking for directions, it's an extremely anxiety-inducing and frightening thing for me. You know? I don't know how to explain. It's just someone said just the word "rape" is

not enough. It's like an actual damaging of your psyche, and that's how I feel. I don't know.

David: Okay. So, the – got to think, there's so many questions. So, I guess you said – the last two events that you at least highlighted, with two cis gender men –

Nadia: Yeah.

David: – one a cousin, and one a white male, and so you sorta described the impacts of making it impossible to have a relationship – any kind of relationship or interaction really with a cis gender male. And I'm wondering if there was any similar – maybe not to the degree or anything like that, but any kind of similar, I guess, effects of the sexual abuse from your female cousin early on with either cis gender women or other female-identified folks.

Nadia: I don't feel like it had a bad effect on me at all, to be honest, because I feel like for the most part, the majority of people in my life who are caring and nurturing to me were still cis women. And so, I didn't have the entire affirmation of patriarchy and what that does to dudes to back that up.

David: So, in many ways, some of the behavior – right? – that these two other guys – their confirmation of – just a history of interactions with men?

Nadia: No, absolutely. And like that's what – even like regular interactions, like somebody can come up and ask me for directions, but the way that they speak to me is so entitled and stuff that it's just the same, like not recognizing my humanity, or not recognizing my agency as a human being. And I guess that's the difference.

Cisgender men as a category, especially heterosexuals but not exclusively, occupy a position of imminent threat and danger for Nadia. Her fear, anger, and frustration—all forms of pain—are rooted in normative and hegemonic masculinity, thus her emphasis on using the qualifier "cis." It is important to note that cis-ness is not limited to the archetype of the hegemonic masculine subject (e.g. middle-class, white, able-bodied, heterosexual man) as theorized in the literature (Connell & Messerschmidt 2005). Cis-ness indexes the privilege derived from comportment to dominant gender norms for the

specific social location and communities a person is in and member of. Therefore, if a person embodies an alternative or minoritized masculinity (e.g. Latino men, gay men, Black men, poor men etc.) from a macrosocial perspective, they still benefit from a network of privileges at the microsocial level if they adhere to the normative gender prescriptions that are specific to the social and cultural context where they are located.[11] This distinction is important because Nadia uses it in her daily traversing of the social world to evaluate people, spaces and places for her relative threat level and possibility for continued harm. All of this indicates a dynamic and complex process by which Nadia is experiencing social harm not only in the present, but also in the pain of the past and the potential pain of the future.

Nadia is forthright in our conversation when making it clear that myself and the occasion of our interview does not exist outside of this calculation; her assumption of my queerness influences her evaluation for the possibility of harm and for optimizing safety. This causes me to imagine those individuals who through their own algorithms of pain calculated that the risk would be too high to participate in this study. This evaluation for potential harm could be a function of people's reservations for engaging their narrative of social harm for fear of triggering various overwhelming feelings, and/or an evaluation of my suitability as a recipient of their life story, or more specifically the possibility that I could be enact some form of social harm, even physical in nature.

The clearest example of the operation of an algorithm of pain, and which caught my attention immediately in the course of our conversation is Nadia's explanation that the sexual abuse she endured because of her female cousin "[doesn't] feel like it had a bad effect on me at all, to be honest, because I feel like for the most part, the majority of people in my life who are caring and nurturing to me were still cis women." Nadia is *not* asserting that the sexual violence she experienced with her cousin was not painful; but

she is making obvious is that her experience of the dimensions of pain is qualitatively different between the abuse by her *female* cousin and the violence by two cisgender men. The breadth and depth of pain for Nadia is different with her female cousin because this abuse is mediated by the fact that the majority of people who are caring and nurturing to Nadia, for whom they feel safe(r) with, are cisgender women. Similarly, Nadia's pain in relation to the two men who raped her is contextualized by consistent, persistent, and continuing social harm she encounters with cisgender men. For Nadia, the abuse of their cousin is an aberration of social harm from another woman, but the rape by a male cousin and friend is in accordance with the norms of the overarching social hierarchy of patriarchy, and also white supremacy (the perpetrator who was a friend was a white male). Additionally, Nadia mentioned her cousin died from an "anorexia-related stroke;" during the course of our conversation she also mentioned that she herself is anorexic. Nadia attributed her anorexia to sexual violence. Thus, it is entirely possible that Nadia is able to form a different kind of connection, maybe even compassion, for her cousin since they both shared the struggle with anorexia. Since Nadia draws a connection between her experience of social harm and developing anorexia, it most likely raises questions for Nadia about what set or sets of trauma could have resulted in her cousin developing anorexia as well.

Nadia highlights the assault in school as her first experience of physical violence outside of the family context. She calculated that it was worth reporting the harm because maybe the authorities at school were different than adults in her family. Unfortunately, Nadia's gamble did not pay off and dominant power was maintained in this situation allowing the boy to assert that Nadia's "bitchy comment" necessitated justifiable retaliation. This account shows how different social contexts produce different evaluations that drive decisions and behaviors, which is the very work of an algorithm of

pain. Lastly, it shows that Nadia's algorithm of pain is dynamic and constantly evolving. Since this was the first physical altercation outside of the family, Nadia took the chance to see if there were different rules in this social space and subsequently found out there were not. As a result of these early formative lessons via the consequences of social harm, Nadia does not report social harm she experiences, even physical social harm that would be most recognizable under the current nation-state legal practices.

Without recognizing algorithms of pain it would be difficult to begin understanding the social harm affecting TLGBQ Latin@s. This framework accounts for shifting meanings across and through time, space, and experience, which then allows us to recognize the sociological significance, and operation of social harm that circumscribes TLGBQ Latin@ lives. As I will reveal, pain is a fundamental organizing principle that structures TLGBQ Latin@ lives, decisions, and narrative representation. Pain in relation to social harm then is a social construction and phenomena that must become a critical element in our analysis of TLGBQ Latin@ life stories.

IDENTIFYING ALGORITHMS OF PAIN: A NOTE ON METHODOLOGY

With life stories I identify the presence or operation of an algorithm of pain in three ways: 1) the shifting meaning of a social harm event within an individual's life story narrative; 2) the connections drawn between seemingly unconnected and different social harm events within a single life story narrative; and 3) different meanings between similar social harm events within an individual's life story or between two or more participants' narratives. There are theoretically other ways to empirically demonstrate the presence and operation of an algorithm of pain, which I will speak to a little later, but these are the primary ways I am able to substantiate algorithms of pain within the confines of the methodological parameters of this project.

All three analytical forms that denote the operation of algorithms of pain emphasize difference because they are not objects that can be directly viewed or measured. Instead, indirect measures indicate their presence. This is very similar to the logic and method underlying audit studies. In the areas of employment (Bertrand & Mullanaithan 2004, Lahey 2005, Pager 2003, Riach & Rich 2002, Pager, Bonikowski & Western 2009) and housing (Hakken 1979, Massey & Lundy 2001, Wienk et al. 1979, Yinger 1995) discrimination, audit studies have been instrumental in substantiating claims of differential treatment. The premise of audit studies is simple: control as many independent variables to isolate the relationship between one particular independent variable and the dependent variable to empirically establish a causal relationship if any measured difference exists. Thus, in the previously cited studies, researchers were attempting to isolate the role of racial and gender discrimination for various outcomes in the employment and housing processes.

Changes or differences in the meaning assigned to social harm events are of paramount importance. The sociological significance stems from the fact that these differences counter the prevailing logic around emotions, emotional evaluations and the experience of violence, discrimination, trauma, or other social harms. Whether one sees emotions as a consistent structured process (Thamm 2007), neurophysiologic in origin (Franks & Smith 1999, Massey 2002), or as social or cultural artifacts (Cahill 1995, Denzin 1984, Hochschild 1990), there is a shared belief that the presence of specific external stimuli will generate the same emotional response across time and social context. The latter school of thought, who views emotions as social artifacts, is more elastic in its ability to understand differences between individuals. This elasticity is a result of the influence of symbolic interactionism in their theoretical and analytical frameworks. This flexibility however is limited to interpersonal differences and does not extend to shifting

intrapersonal evaluations. The dominant logic that emotional appraisals remain stable and consistent over time between individuals is especially applied to experiences of violence and trauma. People's experience of violence and other forms of social harm—how they recognize/acknowledge it, emotionally respond, assign meaning—is often assumed to be conscious, deeply upsetting, and located within an analysis of structural inequality. My interviews with TLGBQ Latin@s dismiss this myth, and insist on the understanding that a person's experience is extremely complex and dynamic. Like an audit study, when we compare social harm events between participants that are very similar or the same in narrative fact[12], but different in narrative representation[13] it is indicative of differing evaluative processes, what I call algorithms of pain, and of great sociological significance.

We see this methodological approach within the analysis of Nadia Abbasi's narrative at the beginning of this chapter. The three experiences of sexual violence Nadia talks about share many details in common: 1) they were all forms of sexual violence, 2) all perpetrators were known to her beforehand, and 3) Nadia did not report any of the incidents. One of the critical differences between the events is the abuse at the hands of Nadia's female cousin lasted for a whole summer and the other two experiences were singular occurrences. It would not be surprising, maybe even expected that Nadia would experience her cousin's abuse as more painful or worse relative to the other events because of the harm over a longer period of time. However, as discussed, the opposite is true. What we ultimately learn is that experience is shaped in large degree by the social harm both preceding and subsequent to it. Thus, Nadia is making an empirical claim using the details of her life that the macrosocial dynamics of heteropatriarchy created situations that resulted in her victimization at the microsocial level. This empirical claim is facilitated by and indicative of Nadia's algorithm of pain.

CHASING THE GHOSTS OF PAIN: COMPARING TLGBQ LATIN@ LIFE STORIES

Nadia Abbasi's life story exemplifies the first two ways of identifying an algorithm of pain. First, Nadia admits the sexual abuse she endured as a 6 year-old was indeed devastating at the time, teaching her that her body was not her own, but over time greater pain was associated with the later episodes of sexual violence. Thus, the meaning shifted for Nadia over her life. The reason for this shift is related to the second way we are able to recognize algorithms of pain. Nadia explains that the sexual violence perpetrated by cis men against her feels worse and has had a greater lasting impact because of the cumulative social harm she has endured by cis men over her life. The meaning assigned and degree of harm felt by Nadia is a function of connecting these events even though the forms of social harm—ranging from rape and physical assault to constant interruptions in conversations and catcalls—were greatly varied. What I have not discussed as of yet is the evidence of algorithms of pain as it manifests itself when observed between multiple TLGBQ Latin@ life stories.

The life stories of Pamela Benitez, Ale Nuñez, and Paloma Delgado are useful for understanding algorithms of pain in order to understand why differences in narrative representation exist while at the same time recognizing the common threads that unify them. Pamela, Ale, and Paloma were either currently earning, or previously had earned money as sex workers. Even though they share this common labor practice, all three narrate their experiences, especially their related emotional appraisals, in very different ways. Pamela Benitez was born in 1990 and was 23 when I interviewed her. Like Nadia, Pamela saw an announcement on Tumblr and was interested enough that she decided to reach out. She is a "transgender" "Chicana" with a "light-brown" complexion. Five months prior, Pamela graduated from a Texas public university with a B.A. in English. When I asked how she would describe her sexuality she responded, "attracted to

women." I interviewed Pamela via Skype; she used the wi-fi available at her place of formal employment. In total, our conversation lasted well over two hours. At the very beginning of all my interviews I ask participants a series of straightforward background questions, one of which concerns how they support themselves. In the following excerpt Pamela responds to this initial inquiry.

David: And then, how do you currently earn money?

Pamela: Uh, eh [pause] as a waitress.

David: Okay. And then – so you're employed at a restaurant?

Pamela: Yes, kind of. It's a non – it's a restaurant that's part of nonprofit.

As you can see, Pamela makes no initial mention of her experiences as a sex worker. Remember, she is doing the interview via the internet connection she had access to at her job in the formal labor market, what she explains is a restaurant connected to a local non-profit community organization. Later on she interrupted:

Pamela: Umm, so I didn't want to bring it up with like people from work around but, um, I do sex work so if you have questions about that?

David: Okay, what has that experience been like?

Pamela: Umm, doing stuff on camera like through webcam it is okay, like you feel a little weird doing it but afterwards it's fine. Doing it in person it's a lot different which I hadn't expected. But I don't know actually feel –I didn't expect to literally feel dirty afterwards but I do.

Pamela distinguishes between cybersex labor and street-level sex work, the type of sex work that draws the most mainstream public and academic attention. She explains that she did not bring up her work previously because of the presence of co-workers, which indicates a level of fear if they or her supervisor were to discover her other forms of paid labor. I also get the sense however that she waits to disclose this information as a way to evaluate me through the course of our conversation, to assess whether I too were

likely to judge and potentially harm her. This sort of interaction is not unique to Pamela Benitez, numerous participants withheld details at an earlier point in the conversation only to share them later on usually with a prompt of whether there was anything else I should know that would help me best understand their experiences and who they are. For instance, this is the way Nadia disclosed the first of their experiences with sexual violence.

For Pamela not all sexual labor is created equal. Both forms of sex work contain some feeling of stigma and awkwardness, but it is the street-level sex work that she singles out as making her feel "dirty." I ask Pamela to explain what she meant by this:

> **David**: Have there been – so when you say dirty, like what makes you feel dirty? What does that mean?
>
> **Pamela**: Part of it is the way, the way the guys look at you, it's like that look I described earlier, they all have that look. The other part is that they – I mean they are not always drunk but a lot of them are drunk. When they are touching you it's always very rough, you can feel that they don't think of you as a person. But you end up being sometimes just a means to an end.
>
> **David**: Yeah. Do you feel – do you ever feel really unsafe during those instances?
>
> **Pamela**: The first night I did for sure.
>
> **David**: The first night like when you were in person or this period when you've done it?
>
> **Pamela**: No, the first night when I was in person, yeah. It's gotten easier since then but every now and then like I think about like the rates of murder for transwomen who are sex workers.

Pamela Benitez's feelings of fear and isolation are rooted in the dehumanizing actions of her clients via their aggressive touching and looks that range from a distant blankness to a type of belligerent insistence. Additionally, street-level sex work for

Pamela represents a form of labor that is populated by the ghosts of trans women of color who have been killed during the course of their labor. All of this produces a very specific assessment of street sex work: one that she does out of sheer necessity to afford her hormones, which she cannot do by just working at the restaurant. Pamela explains that she may go two or more weeks between the nights she works based upon her financial need to purchase her hormones to support her continued transition.

Pamela also does web-based sex work but only mentions it briefly in passing and never talks about it again. Although this sex work may have some measure of embarrassment for Pamela, it is a form of pain that does not foreclose the possibility of contentment or even pleasure. In her testimonio, the representation of her cybersex labor does not occupy the same geography of pain as her street-level sex work. Pamela does not evaluate all forms of sex work in the same way. Her web-based sex work does not contain the social elements that her current algorithm of pain would elicit as danger or "feel[ing] dirty." These elements include the aggressive touching, frequent client intoxication, dehumanizing looks, and thoughts of murdered trans women. Inherent to algorithms of pain is the understanding that experiences of pain are mediated through, and connected to other social harm events as well as positive or affirming life events. Therefore, Pamela's determination that web-based sex work for her is okay is related to the fact that it does not entail the same sorts of vulnerabilities and social dynamics as street-level sex work. She is able to retain a greater degree of control within this particular labor arrangement than street-level sex work. Other transgender and genderqueer Latin@s evaluate sex work in different ways.

Ale Nuñez was born in 1992 and was 20 years old, soon to be 21, at the time of our meeting. Ale and I met via Skype after having been introduced to one another by Oscar Bustamante, another research participant. Ale is a "busty," "gender-fluid," "fat"

"Latina" of Cuban-descent with an "hour glass figure, [but] no ass." They describe their sexuality as "bisexual/pansexual" and when I inquire what their preferred gender pronouns are, Ale says, "they/them." The interview lasted just over two hours. At the beginning of our conversation I asked them how they financially support themself. The frank and forward responses Ale gives at this very early point in our conversation prove informative.

David: And then, how would you say now you currently earn money?

Ale: I'm a cam girl.

David: Okay and how would you?

Ale: So I do sex work.

David: Okay and the, the web correct? That's what a cam girl…

Ale: Yeah I do legal sex work. I'm also applying for SSI but, I'm having trouble with that because you kind to have to have a form in order to get in and use for it and I don't have a form so…

David: Okay and then so is it through your work as a cam girl that you are, sort of that's your sole source of income?

Ale: At this point yes. Also I have a donation option on my Tumblr.

Ale engages in a type of web-based sex work where a person conducts sexual services that are simulcast to multiple customers or is conducted as a one-on-one session. Ale does not hesitate in letting me know what they do to economically support themself. Cam work is a legal form of sex work in the U.S., which is an important detail; however, I would provide the caveat that even though cam work does not draw in the state in the same ways as street-level sex work, to be a sex worker of any variety is often denigrated and looked down upon. Undoubtedly though, engaging in a legal form of sex work is a

privilege over other kinds of criminalized sex work. Whereas, compared to Pamela who only partially supports herself through sex work, for Ale cam work is the sole source or income. Ale has an extraordinarily complex relationship to sexual labor. This is best illustrated in the following excerpt:

David: Okay and so what have your experiences camming been like?

Ale: It has been a little frustrating, really rewarding in that I make 40 dollars in an hour instead of in six hours, but it's a little frustrating because I choose to sell myself as Latina, they have categories that it's more for fetish stuff than for actual race. So if you're Filipina and you don't identify as Latino, but you look like the stereotype, as Gina Torres says "Americans like their Latinos to look Italian," then you would go in the Latino category. I didn't know that when I joined. So I should be in the white category because I'd make more money, because I am the type of girl they wanted to be in the white category. I'm too pale to be in the Latina category, I don't have the traditional Latina figure – I've got an hour glass figure, no ass, it's not what they want in the Latina category. And so if I had to restart again I definitely would put myself in the white category despite the fact that it is really painful for me to say that because all the time I'm just sending my right identifiers Latino and then at work, I would have to be look white because it's what makes the money, cuz there's this stereotype of Latino, uh Latina cam girls as very much gold diggers and basically only slightly better than black cam girls. But most people who watch cam sites are kind of racist. And I always get told how good my English is. I said I came over in the 20s, it should be good.

David: Yeah.

Ale: It makes me angry. But umm it's the best job I've ever had. I don't need to leave the house, I don't need to deal with people sexually harassing me because I have a lot of bosses, that have used the fact that I have big tits to mean I am open to sexual advances by them, even teachers. Because I've been busty my whole life. I was a double D in sixth grade and one of my teachers propositioned me for sex and I said no. So it's on my terms. I get to be sexual on my terms, I get to earn money for it, it's nice. It's actually a really good job for me.

David: So besides like obviously like the categories that are created and where you think you would make the most or how people would see you, are

there any other sort of things that you've experienced that you hadn't quite liked about it that you wish were better?

Ale: I don't like the guys who have the incest kinks and they throw it on you without asking if you're okay with doing that, I've gotten triggered before and broke down crying on cam. Like one guy asked me if I wanted to do daddy-daughter and it was right after I had had that nightmare and I ended up breaking down on cam. I don't like the guys that bully me about my weight like I'm in a BBW category. And I'm not on the first page or anything so you have to be into big women to find me.

David: What does BBW stand for?

Ale: BBW stands for Big Beautiful Women.

David: Okay.

Ale: Basically it's the fat chick. And so these guys have to actively go and look for fat girls to bully. Also there was a guy who wanted me to fuck a dog on-camera which would have gotten banned and it's gross anyway. And one guy who confessed to me that he raped a co-worker. But mostly it's been a good experience and if you paint this as a bad experience in any way shape I will hunt you down.

David: Okay.

Ale: Because this has been my savior honestly.

David: Yeah, what – what do you like the most about it?

Ale: The fact that I can be sexual, I'm very good at being sexual, I'm a very sexual person and I've got a very high sex drive and so that's nice. Also the fact that I get to talk to guys, just talk to them in general, also the fact that I don't have to leave my house.

Ale interweaves a plethora of emotions about being a cam girl. Traditionally, sex work is depicted as a form of labor that makes individuals who are in the sex labor market vulnerable to a variety of social harms, such as harassment, physical or sexual assault, and STIs. But as Ale reveals, their form of sex work keeps them safe from social harms prevalent in formal labor markets. Ale does not have to worry about sexually harassing supervisors or co-workers as a cam girl, which is paramount for given their

early childhood experience of sexual abuse. While it protects them from this social harm it does not protect them from all forms. Ale's comments illuminate the *racialized economies of desire* (Dwight McBride 2005) that structure the online transactions of cam girls and cam boys. Ale states that they could make more money if they took advantage of their light-skin privilege and place themselves within the white cam girl section of the website. For them, however, it is important to assert their Latina identity. As Ale reveals, they have light-skin privilege, but within their own family they were maligned as the "dark one" because of their dark brown hair and eyes and larger round nose in contrast to their sister's blue eyes, blonde hair, and petite pointed nose. What complicates Ale's story even more is that they did not always know while growing up that they were Latina, specifically of Cuban-descent. Ale's father, a fairly abusive figure, grew up in a part of Queens, New York that was predominantly Italian; Ale's father's family decided to pass as Italian instead of Latino. Thus, for Ale to place themselves within the white category of cam girl sex work, would be to, in their evaluation, affirm their family's legacy of self-imposed racial and ethnic amnesia and condone the racialized harm Ale received from their family growing up. As a result, Ale accepts one form of social harm, less income due to racial stratification of labor market, to gain a sense of cultural and racial *orgullo* (pride).

Ale is adamant that being a cam girl has been a great experience, and that I should represent it only as such. After all, being a cam girl has been a very beneficial form of labor, in part because it has provided a space for them to explore their body and sexuality in a safer space, which is paramount given that Ale is a survivor of sexual abuse. Ale is able to have sexual conversations and interactions with men in a more controlled environment, a benefit that Pamela does not have when she conducts sex work on the street. I emphasize safer and more controlled and not completely safe and controlled,

because Ale states they have received fantasy role-play requests that perform Daddy-Daughter incest scenarios, along with other taboo sexual practices such as bestiality. Ale's comment about being bullied for their size is indicative of the fragility and fraught nature of the safety they're able to construct when we consider the fact that they are listed under the Big Beautiful Women category. Yet, Ale's labor as a cam girl, most of the time, affirms their sexuality and body size and type, a form of emotional sustenance and capital that should not be underestimated. Ale's final comment about their work allowing them to stay home is especially important to them, because they mentioned repeatedly throughout our conversation that they try to leave their home as little as possible, limiting it preferably to no more than once a week. Leaving home and being in public or social spaces is an anxiety filled process for Ale, so being a cam girl is ideal.

Relative to Pamela and Ale, Paloma Delgado has a much more pragmatic and relatively neutral assessment of her experiences as a sex worker. Paloma invited me to her home on a Friday evening to talk. When I arrived at her home I was greeted at the door by both of her energetic dogs, one of which made it their duty to every so often come by and sniff me. Before we began the interview, Paloma offered me some water as we sat kitty corner from one another, I on the couch and she on the loveseat. At the time of our meeting, Paloma is 52 years old and a native resident of central Texas her whole life. She is a transgender Latina of Mexican-descent with "brownish" skin, but says she is White because that is what is on her birth certificate. Paloma speaks with a distinct manner that is quite common for Latin@s who grew up in f Texas. Paloma dropped out of school at a very young age, thirteen, but since then has earned a G.E.D. and taken a few college courses; she does not have a college degree. She often jokingly tells folks, "'Well, honey the only degrees I have is a second degree and a third degree felony.' And I'm not proud of that but I am proud of that because I've learned a lot along the way."

She spent eight years in a Texas penitentiary. Unlike Pamela and Ale, at the time of our conversation Paloma is no longer a sex worker and I asked her how she supported herself

Paloma: I am currently [wearing] several hats but currently I'm employed at [an HIV/AIDS prevention organization], I coordinate their CDC and SAMHSA—Substance Abuse Mental Health Services Administration—testing programs, HIV testing programs, so I coordinate both of those programs. To counseling and –

David: A little bit of everything

Paloma: Educating and safer sex education.

David: And then if you have to label your occupation what would you say it is?

Paloma: Label my occupation; my title is HIV testing Program Coordinator.

David: Okay and how long have you been doing HIV/AIDS services for?

Paloma: About [a long pause] a little over five and a half years.

David: And what did you do before that?

Paloma: I mean do you really want to know? Well I did a little bit of everything; I've always been the type of individual that is self-sufficient and I've used whatever survival skills I need to survive. For a long time of course I depended on my mom for – in terms of housing or a roof. However, my other needs I'm not only relying on her for that but that was sort of the norm in my family. Mom wanted all her kids there with her; no matter how old we were, we were sort of old fashioned. It's not like moms nowadays, "No, you're done with school get out, go find a job, go do something out now." Mom provided for us and she wanted us all there with her instead and sort of and – more of that a little bit later probably. But yeah, I've always sought different forms of survival, sometimes employment, sometimes other means of survival.

Paloma states matter-of-factly that she currently works for an HIV/AIDS prevention organization. Since she has only worked there for five years, and given her age, I inquired what she did beforehand. Unlike Ale who stated immediately and Pamela who waited until much later to say anything, Paloma euphemistically implies her past

labor practice as a sex worker stressing that she's always done what is necessary to survive. She was quick to put limits on our conversation about sex work early in the interview, because she did not want to attract judgment or fetishization.[14] Paloma began sex work at the age of thirteen when she ran away from home. As Paloma explained it, her dad was physically abusive throughout her childhood to her and her mom and siblings. When she was thirteen, she was found to be skipping school with her brother and some other adolescents. Initially only her brother's truancy was found out, but after a quick meeting at the school the staff reported Paloma's truancy as well to her parents. Paloma explained

> …so we went back home and I was going to get the same beating they [her brother] were getting. When I got home, my brother was getting that and so when it was my turn, I was – when it was my turn, I was out the door. And so my family didn't see or hear from me until I turned 18, yeah. I left home – by that time, by that point in my life at 13 – 12, 13, I was already getting exposure, we lived so close to downtown that I was getting exposure to the older drag queens and the sex industry workers, and the nightlife girls…

At the age of thirteen Paloma could no longer endure her father's physical abuse. Due to her family's close proximity to downtown and her parent's operation of a cantina, she was already familiar with a number of the older drag queens and sex workers who helped her survive as a homeless trans Latina youth in a Texas urban center in 1974. Between 1974 and until approximately 1981, Paloma lived between the urban center of her birth and a nearby military base. Given her highly transient life at the time I asked

> **David:** How did you get around – like how did – let's– whether it's like just transportation or living situation –?
>
> **Paloma:** I didn't – you have the best questions ever. So right away at a really young age when I came into the nightlife environment, I quickly started learning survival skills, I quickly started learning that I was young, that I was beautiful and all the tricks were going to want me. So I quickly

started learning to charge more than average and so I became independent that way.

David: When you said you learned it, did like other queens tell you?

Paloma: The other queens, that's what they would do for survival so when I came to hang with them and stuff, they taught me the ropes really quick. They told me charge this much, never go far, always -- someone see you get in the car, then try to get license plates and so they laced me up to the game really quick. And I've always been a quick learner anyway, and so, yeah when I first – the very first couple of visits to [the military base and surrounding community], me and my very best friend – may she rest in peace [Sandra], we met downtown, skipping school one day and became the best of friends, we sort of metamorphosized together. She got killed.

And – so we used to hitchhike – we used to get on [the interstate] and when we were teenagers, we were 13, 14, 15 and we stopped 18-wheelers like that and so, that's how we got around once we were in [the city by the military base], the same thing, there was so many guys there, so many soldiers from all around the world. And I guess in – I don't like to say this a lot and probably because I don't want it to sound like I'm bragging, but I guess that I've always been puffing because I've really never done anything to my body to alter my body. I don't grow hair on my arms, I don't grow hair on my legs, I don't grow hair on my chest, I do grow hair on my face but there is a remedy for that.

My hands are not big, my feet are not big, so, I never had a problem. There have been some times when someone discovered my sexual – my gender orientation or my genitalia and there was trouble where I had to fight or whatever. Or friends that I was hanging out with, they had big voices or big hands and so they kind of gave us away and then we had to group fight or whatever, but I never had a problem. And so for survival in [the city outside the base], it was not so much tricking, it wasn't so much just manipulating the guys, we would – I was a teenager still and I would manipulate them to let me use the car for the day, go drop them off on post while they did their duty or whatever and I kept the car.

I would come to [my hometown] to see friends and stuff like that, manipulation to pay my rent and stuff like that, so and didn't really had to do too much sexually. Just use mental tactics, I'm pregnant or I'm on my periods or whatever. So yeah, that was pretty much it, however when I was in [the town outside of the military base] once I turned 18

or 19, the street life started getting a little harder, I was not as young anymore. So not only I by the time I got introduced to drugs, started shooting up, got introduced to –

David: By that you mean like heroine?

Paloma: Back then, I started off with – it was a pill but that was called a Quaalude – Quaalude I don't know if you know what that is? We would dissolve it in a test tube and pick it up on the syringe and shoot it, it was kind of a speed. It was kind of like a – it was a dietetic – it was the diet pill, it was prescribed for losing weight. But it was kind of like a speed, just give you this hot flash, and body rush, and all these kind of stuff and so, friends were doing it and I fought it for a few years and oh no, I'll never do that and oh no, I'll never do that. So finally –.

Paloma's narrative of her labor and experiences with sex work are interwoven with issues pertaining to her sexuality, gender identity and expression, family violence, friendship, mentorship, loss, murder, and addiction. Paloma's algorithm of pain connects and fuses all of these social elements in her life that structure and shape her experience of sex work and ultimately informs the narrative representation of her labor in her life story. Paloma on one hand is extremely proud of how fast a learner she is at learning the tricks of the trade from the older and more experienced street queens, keeping in mind that these "older" queens are likely only in their late teens or early to mid-twenties themselves. She is also very pleased with how attractive she is to potential clients. A majority of this affirmation is rooted in her ability to pass as a cisgender girl/woman relative to other trans sex workers. Additionally, the desire she was able to command allowed her to charge higher fees for her sexual labor than other sex workers, which gave her an even greater ability to financially support herself. The willingness of clients to pay higher prices was a concrete measure of her value in this niche labor market. Finally, the sex labor market enabled Paloma to meet other trans Latinas, including Sandra, who would become her closest friend and confidant, someone whom Paloma repeatedly referred to as her sister. With Sandra and other trans Latinas, she was able to establish a

form of support, intimacy, and *bondad* (caring) that she did not have receive from her family of origin, especially during her childhood.

Paloma's narrative of sexual labor, however, is not simply a story of affirmation and relative economic security. Paloma associates her sex work, and that of others, as part and parcel of the overall street life, including illicit drug use and, for many, addiction. Paloma explains that she resisted using drugs for a period of time, but eventually began using because so many of her friends were using. It is also possible Paloma used drugs as a form of self-medication because she stated that street life got harder once she turned 18 and 19; she was no longer "young" and as quite in demand that her 13, 14, and 15 year old self was. There were very few regrets Paloma shared in our conversation, but the greatest one is her struggle with addiction. The regret, shame, and sadness largely stems from the fact that her drug addiction ultimately led to her imprisonment. She was not incarcerated on drug charges, but rather for theft and burglary. While she was imprisoned, Paloma's mother became very ill and eventually passed away. By this time, years before her incarceration, Paloma had reunited with her mother and siblings, and had formed a very strong bond with her mother. Not being with her mother and able to attend the funeral was devastating. When I met Paloma she is five and half years sober. Although she admits that sobriety is still a challenge, much of her motivation is fueled by the knowledge of what her addiction has cost her, especially her emotions surrounding the passing of her mother. Paloma associates her street life, including her sex work, as enabling her addiction.

The killing of Paloma's friend Sandra also left an incredible emotional scar. Sandra was murdered downtown in the city outside of the military base they frequented so often. Sandra's attack was brutal, she suffered severe physical trauma to the point that an open casket funeral was impossible. Paloma understands Sandra's murder as a hate

crime, one associated with and an ever-present threat in the street life they coerced into as Latina trans women. Whereas, the ghosts of trans women murdered as reported by news outlets, social media, and trans social networks populate Pamela's algorithm of pain; Paloma's algorithm is shaped by the very material loss of her trans *comadre*. This experience of loss and mourning is not only emotional, but also deeply physical in its sensation and feeling.

In a careful reading of Paloma's life story, I come to recognize how the dominant logics and overarching dynamics of social harm systems provide her with situational and transitory privileges that ultimately reify social hierarchies and attendant pain, including her own. For example, the sex labor market that allows Paloma to charge higher prices than other sex workers is the result of transmisogyny, patriarchy, and ageism. Paloma stated plainly that the desire and attraction she commanded from clients was because she was young, recall she began when she was just 13 years old, and could pass for a young girl because her physical characteristics were more in alignment with cisgender beauty and aesthetic standards. I do not deny Paloma's agency as a sexual being able to work in a sex labor market, but her first five years as a sex worker were as a minor whose adult clients ultimately exploited the social harm in her family home. In fact, the social harm Paloma encountered in her home, as a child, was not limited to the physical abuse of her father; Paloma recounts to me a time when one of her brothers attempt to rape her while everyone else was asleep. According to Paloma, her brother was not successful, but always was, and continues to this day, to be especially aggressive towards her because of her transgender identity. The same patriarchy and transmisogyny that licenses sexual violence and exploitation of all forms, harms Paloma in the home, but situationally and temporarily affords economic benefits in the illicit sex labor market. These benefits quickly evaporate as she mentions by the time she is 18 and 19 when she ages out and is

no longer an underage sex worker. Paloma's ability to pass and conform to cisgender beauty and aesthetic standards is limited, according to her testimonio, to when she is not around other transgender women, especially those trans women who cannot pass. Although Paloma makes the choice to socialize publicly with other trans women maintaining the social relationships that provide emotional, social, economic and physical resources and capital, it at times comes at a cost that requires her to fight what she refers to as "group fights"—those instances where a group member is clocked as trans and subsequently harassed necessitating all members to defend that member's bodily integrity as a means to ensure the everyone else's.

In general, Paloma conveys a sense of pride in her ability to survive, however, her stressing that it is a form of economic survival indicates an algorithm of pain that assigns sexual labor as a pragmatic course of action but in no way is an ideal situation. The clearly articulated differences in narrative representation and social meaning attached to sex work and sexual labor in the life stories of Pamela Benitez, Ale Nuñez, and Paloma Delgado is an empirical manifestation of algorithms of pain. What makes these differences more compelling along with algorithms of pain as an explanatory framework are the number of important similarities that each shares with the others. All three espouse nonnormative gender identities and/or expressions, in addition to occupying various levels of economic vulnerability and precariousness throughout their life. Pamela and Paloma experience street-level sex work in very different ways even though both are haunted in similar, albeit somewhat different, ways by the all too frequent occurrence of trans women homicides. Although home life within their family of origin appears to be a critical element in both Ale's and Paloma's algorithms of pain, in addition to both experiencing consistent physical and sexual social harm during childhood and

adolescence in their family home, Ale communicates a much more explicit positive assessment of sexual labor relative to Paloma.

In the end, in all three-life story representations of sex work, we observe the presence of pain stemming from social harm *and* various forms of benefits and positivity. Despite this shared trend, it would be a mistake to flatten the analysis to artificially emphasize either the differences or the similarities. It is only through the broad perspective on pain a social harm framework affords, along with its insistence on a life history approach, that we are able to hold the three life stories in all of their complexity and representational similarities and differences in productive tension. Identifying the presence and operation of *algorithms of pain* provides a much needed rubric to understand the social harm and pain TLGBQ Latin@s, including Nadia, Pamela, Ale, and Paloma endure because of multiple dominant social hierarchies.

THE SOCIOLOGICAL PANTHEON: SITUATING ALGORITHMS OF PAIN

Algorithm of pain builds upon the sociology of emotions (Clark 1990, Collins 1993, Franks 2003, Hochschild 2012 [1983], Kemper 1978a & 1978b, Scheff 1988 & 1990, Stets 2004, Turner 1999 & 2002). It extends in critical ways the centrality of racism, patriarchy, transmisogyny, homophobia, class exploitation, and xenophobia to the construction and experience of emotions—especially regarding pain—and the resulting impact on social interaction, social cohesion, and the reproduction of social harm.

George Herbert Mead (1934) provides a critical understanding of how and why human emotion is produced, and critical to social interaction. Internalized expectations based on beliefs of society can produce feelings of shame, embarrassment, and fear. Individuals compare their behavior and beliefs to their internal generalized other, which

in turn causes specific emotional reactions depending on the degree of conformity or nonconformity with social norms and expectations. The implicit incorporation of emotion as a key social dynamic has continued with scholars like Erving Goffman (1959 & 1967) in his concern for how people perform "impression management" in order to guarantee others' positive impressions or to help mitigate any consequences from negative interactions. One can even argue that Herbert Blumer's (1969) rationale that "joint action" is the basis for and building blocks of human societies can only be made possible through the affective dimension of joint actions between individuals and individuals and the collective whole.

Within the sociology of emotions, a strain of scholarly focus concerns the role of emotions in the reproduction of social inequality; this is especially true among those researchers utilizing symbolic interactionist methods and analysis in their studies (Fields, Copp & Kleinman 2007). Of the intersection between emotion, identity, and social inequality, the overwhelming majority of research has concerned the relationship between gender and emotions. Some have explored "doing emotion as doing gender" (Shields 1995 & 2002), building upon the seminal work of West and Zimmerman (1987) that posited gender categories as a series of socially ascribed and performed behaviors. Others have used an expectations theory framework to explain how emotions are a critical vehicle for communicating status beliefs that maintain social hierarchies, especially those status beliefs attached to specific gender categories that maintain patriarchy (Ridgeway & Bourg 2004). Possibly no one else has been as more influential and foundational to the study of emotions, identity, gender, and social inequality than Arlie Russell Hochschild (2012[1983]) and her theory concerning *feeling rules*, *emotional labor*, and *emotional work*. Hochschild (1998) posits that a dominant culture of emotion exists, and the constitutive elements of this culture are an "emotional dictionary"

and an "emotional bible." Between the emotional dictionary and bible, feeling rules are established and maintained; these rules determine who is able and in what social context particular emotions are allowed, expected, or demanded (Ibid.). She distinguishes between emotional labor, which takes place in public like the labor market, and emotional work that "refer[s] to these same acts [emotional labor] done in a private context where they have *use value*" (Ibid.). Hochschild (2012[1983]) illustrates how feeling rules are differentially applied along strict gendered lines that result in the reification of gendered emotional stereotypes and patriarchal social relations.

The body of sociological scholarship on gender and emotions has been helpful in articulating a critical social mechanism by which gendered inequality has been created and is continually maintained. However, there are two major critical limitations within this scholarship: 1) its treatment and consideration of emotions as almost exclusively socially derived; and 2) the absence of race and racism within sociological models and analysis of emotions. While I agree that emotions are largely socially mediated, I emphasize that emotions are also biological, cognitive, unconscious, and for many, spiritual in nature. If you recall, I argue that emotions are a form of information, that is their most basic function for an individual and can be understood as a meta-sense. Thus, if we unnecessarily emphasize a particular dimension of emotion we foreclose our ability to recognize emotions that manifest in ways that lie outside of our own expectations. This is especially true for subconscious or unconscious manifestations of emotional information. For example, Ale Nuñez simultaneously describes their experience of sex work as painful and harmful while putting forth a dominant meaning of good and beneficial; I argue, this should be interpreted as a subconscious emotional representation that is meant to communicate all of the emotional information available concerning their cam girl labor. Paloma Delgado's talks about the danger her trans friends encounter when

their biological sex is recognized or presumed, but what goes unstated yet is implied is the insecurity and potentially conflicting emotions Paloma sometimes has in being with her friends because of their unpassability. The insecurity in Paloma's life story is never explicitly labeled, and is represented primarily through the silence that exists in the implication of positioning both stories in the way she does. I argue this is an unconscious manifestation and representation of emotion, which would be easily overlooked if we applied a standard conscious rubric of what insecurity and conflict are supposed to look like. An inherent assumption of algorithms of pain is that emotions exist within the human subconscious and unconscious, and therefore their expression and manifestation within individual and collective life stories will not always follow common, traditional, or prescribed outlets and representation.

Whereas, the link between gender and emotions has been extensively examined and analyzed, the relationship between emotions and race and racism has been surprisingly ill attended and under-theorized. Algorithms of pain, along with a social harm framework, are a step in that direction. In her pathbreaking article about a group of ethnically diverse female business owners in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Kiran Mirchandani (2003) emphatically argued for the need to incorporate race and racism as an analytical lens to understand emotional labor. Unfortunately, within the sociology of emotion not many have followed in her footsteps (Wilkins & Pace 2014), even when emotions remain an implicit element, if not an invisible force, within many studies of race and racism. Some of the helpful touch points for this study include Feagin's (2009) *white racial frame,* which explicitly theorizes emotional content as a central dimension of white racial discourse. Additionally helpful is Beeman's (2007) content analysis of 41 U.S. films that resulted in her conceptualization of "emotional segregation," which "is defined as an institutionalized process, whereby European Americans are unable to see people of

colour as emotional equals or as capable of sharing the same human emotions and experiences" (p. 687). Beeman's recognition of emotional segregation is hardly surprising given the racist historical understanding that enslaved Africans and indigenous peoples in the United States had an empirically different relationship to emotions, especially the feeling of pain; creating the widely held belief that people of European descent had a greater capacity for suffering because of the civilizing process modernity catalyzed, a capacity that Africans and indigenous peoples could not contain (Morris 1991, p. 38-40).

This project builds upon these critical efforts to explore and catalogue the dynamic historical and contemporary relationship emotions has to race and racism, by arguing that emotions are central to *any* understanding of race and racism in the United States. I argue that W. E. B. DuBois—not Mead, or even Marx and Durkheim—provides a direct and more concrete antecedent to the field of sociology of emotion that emerged in the 1970's. In *The Souls of Black Folk* (1994[1903]), DuBois unequivocally states "[b]etween me and the other world [white people] there is ever an unasked question…How does it feel to be a problem?" (p. 1). Double-consciousness, DuBois' famous theoretical concept, is grounded in racialized emotional experiences. We see this when he writes

> the Negro is a sort of seventh son, born with a veil, and gifted with second-sight in this American world—a world which yields him no true self-consciousness, but only lets him see himself through the revelation of the other world. It is a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his two-ness—an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder. (1994 [1903], p. 2)

These emotional experiences were the product of the racist regime DuBois chronicled. Most importantly, the observation and critique of white supremacist structures and practices was rooted in manifestations and everydayness of Black pain. Ironically, given DuBois' explicit use and naming of feelings and emotions, the field of sociology of emotion has elided DuBois' theorization of emotion in U.S. society, especially its racialized dimensions. I argue it is the invisibility of DuBois' contribution that explains in part why pain has not garnered more theoretical and empirical attention from emotions scholars outside of those looking at the emotional consequences of physical pain (Francis 2007). Algorithms of pain seeks to resuscitate this intellectual line of inquiry within U.S. sociology, to establish in unequivocal terms the necessity to turn our analytical gaze and understanding towards pain in all it's dimensions: racialized, gendered, sexualized, and classed.

In addition to the sociological literature, several interdisciplinary scholars have also been helpful interlocutors for this project. Saidiya V. Hartman's (1997) ideas around racial terror provide a useful bridge between social harm and algorithms of pain. She notes that with regards to the experience of enslaved Africans, there is an expectation to always and only see in the historical archive explicit forms of oppositional consciousness instead of "inadvertent, contingent, and submerged forms of contestation" to an institution who's dehumanizing practices were total and varied as they were extreme (Hartman 1997, p. 62). David L. Eng and Shinhee Han's (2000) theorization of *racial melancholia* has been a necessary intervention into psychoanalytic theory by connecting mourning and grief to the social processes of immigration, assimilation, and racialization for Asian Americans. They have shown how specific manifestations of pain are connected to large collective social processes that have critical individual impacts, such as depression.

Gloria Anzaldúa, Chicana Feminism, and Pain

This project's intellectual inheritance spans several bodies of knowledge and wisdom, only one of which is sociology. As a TLGBQ Latin@ project, one of the natural intellectual incubators has been Chicana/Latina feminism; none more so than Chicana lesbian feminist, Gloria Evangelina Anzaldúa. Her concept of *la facultad* has been one of the most critical interlocutors for developing algorithms of pain. Beyond this intellectual relationship, the importance of Anzaldúa's work represents a bit of historical, social, and even spiritual poetry, for Anzaldúa was not just Chicana, but more specifically a Tejana from South Texas who four decades ago attended the University of Texas at Austin. Therefore, one can imagine if this project were done at another time, she could and would very well have been a participant.

La facultad, a central Anzaldúan concept, represents Anzaldúa's effort to describe a very particular type of human epistemology, to describe a way of knowing that exists outside of traditional Western notions of objectivity and rationality.[15] She explains

> *La facultad* [emphasis hers] is the capacity to see in surface phenomena the meaning of deeper realities, to see the deep structure below the surface. It is an instant "sensing," a quick perception arrived at without conscious reasoning. It is an acute awareness mediated by the part of the psyche that does not speak, that communicates in images and symbols which are the faces of feelings, that is, behind which feelings reside/hide. The one possessing this sensitivity is excruciatingly alive to the world.
>
> Those who are pushed out of the tribe for being different are likely to become more sensitized (when not brutalized into insensitivity). Those who do not feel psychologically or physically safe in the world are more apt to develop this sense. Those who are pounced on the most have it the strongest—the females, the homosexuals of all races, the dark-skinned, the outcast, the persecuted, the marginalized, the foreign.
>
> When we're up against the wall, when we have all sorts of oppressions coming at us, we are forced to develop this faculty so that we'll know when the next person is going to slap us or lock us away. We'll sense the rapist when he's five blocks down the street. Pain makes us acutely anxious to avoid more of it, so we hone

> that radar. It's a kind of survival tactic that people, caught between the worlds, unknowingly cultivate. It is latent in all of us. (1987, p. 38-39)

Anzaldúa emphasizes the importance of information, meaning, knowledge, and wisdom that is gleaned through subconscious and unconscious affective experiences. It is within the realm of la facultad that we pierce the social veil, or as Anzaldúa describes it, "the deep structure below the surface," where meaning is observed. La facultad enables a person to enter into the *Coetlicue state* and ultimately develop a *mestiza consciousness*—a state of physical, psychological, emotional, and spiritual being where one is or is becoming decolonized by dominant ideologies and practices pertaining to race, culture, gender, sexuality, class, ability, and national origin.

Importantly, Anzaldúa roots the development, growth, and sensitivity of la facultad to those individuals whose identities place them at the social margins of society, especially those who embody multiple marginalized identities. Partly, she explains, this is the result of the need to develop a survival technique and strategy to avoid various forms of harm. She explains that systems of subordination produce la facultad, and as a consequence, those socially positioned at the bottom of these multiple hierarchies perceive the deeper meanings and realities of the social and institutional practices that maintain these oppressive inequalities. TLGBQ Latin@s, therefore, are especially equipped to recognize and understand the myriad of actions that constitute social harm and negatively impinge on their freedom, liberty, safety, and overall quality of life. Anzaldúa explains that the potential for la facultad lies in all people, marginalized and privileged, but that we must remain open to this form of knowing and perceiving. For Anzaldúa it is not a given that TLGBQ Latin@s, or any oppressed Others, will be open to and develop la facultad just because of their social membership. She makes explicit that the brutality, pain, and harm a person endures can foreclose la facultad and instead be

pushed into "insensitivity." All of this raises the question: how are algorithms of pain and la facultad similar or different?

The greatest similarities between la facultad and algorithms of pain first reside in their function for survival, to avoid further harm and pain, and secondly, the centrality of the subconsciousness and unconsciousness. Both la facultad and algorithms of pain aid individuals navigate a social world replete with countless forms of social harm; of greatest importance is physical integrity and safety, identifying potential threats. Gloria Anzaldúa speaks of this in reference to where the next slap will come from or where a potential rapist is located. In this chapter, we observe this function with Nadia Abbasi and how she now relates to cisgender men. The cumulative effect of sexual violence and other patriarchal social harm has had a profound effect on the structure and content of Nadia's algorithm of pain. We see in her life story that at the moment of Nadia and my meeting their algorithm of pain is constantly evaluating cisgender men, including myself, to calculate on one hand risk probabilities.

Gloria Anzaldúa had a very complex view on the constitution of an individual. She implicitly believed an individual life involved the body, the psyche (i.e. the mind comprising of conscious and subconscious processes), emotions, unconsciousness, and the soul/spirit. In Anzaldúan theory, all elements or dimensions of a human being are put into the service of la facultad. Some many not use the same language Anzaldúa utilizes, especially as it relates to the soul/spirit and its connection to la facultad; others may refer to a "nagging feeling," intuition, an "inescapable thought." It is my understanding that these are all referring to the same phenomenological experience. Similarly, algorithms of pain are situated in what some refer to as intuition, unconsciousness, or the soul/spirit; in essence, that part of our humanity that escapes the confines of conscious language and parameters, but shapes and informs our embodied experiences and conscious processes.

Even though la facultad and algorithms of pain share these similarities, there are critical differences between the two. The greatest of which is that in my observation, a TLGBQ Latin@'s algorithm of pain does not guarantee a mestiza consciousness; in other words, an algorithm of pain has no intentional altruistic aims or purpose. Rather, it conceptualizes how my TLGBQ Latin@ participants experience pain, give meaning to that pain and related social dynamics, and ultimately shape attitudes and behavior. Whereas, la facultad, according to Anzaldúa, is the sensitivity to pain to which one may be "brutalized to insensitivity," algorithms of pain explicitly posits that TLGBQ Latin@s will always register the pain stemming from social harm, but that the pain may never rise to the level of consciousness. In other words, depending on the specific elements and structure of a TLGBQ Latin@'s algorithm of pain, the degree of hurt one feels may seemingly be nothing or quite little, but that does not mean they are insensitive to it. This is a theme I will come back to in Chapter 3.

Lastly, Anzaldúa posits that although la facultad is a skill that all people can possess, it is much more likely to be had by those multiply marginalized, this does not apply to algorithms of pain. Even though this study focuses on TLGBQ Latin@s and the specific themes, trends, and contradictions I have observed in their life stories, algorithms of pain I would argue are not unique to just TLGBQ Latin@s. This is not to say that the algorithms of pain are the same or similar between groups, for even among TLGBQ Latin@s in this project there is great variety in algorithms of pain as I have explored in this chapter with Ale, Pamela, and Paloma. Additionally, I argue what structures the relationship between the state and TLGBQ Latin@s is the state's adoption of an algorithm of pain for itself that is sensitive to the pain of privileged groups and individuals but is incompatible and antagonistic to TLGBQ Latin@ communities, this argument forms the basis of what will be explored in the following chapter. Thus,

algorithms of pain are not the exclusive property of TLGBQ Latin@s, but could potentially be a critical constitutive element of Anzaldúa's la facultad.

CONCLUSION

To answer the question of how are TLGBQ Latin@ people experiencing social harm in the late 20th and early 21st centuries, we must first understand TLGBQ Latin@ pain in terms of its causes, meaning, and representation. Pain is the most basic and fundamental effect of social harm, whether we are talking about racialized, gendered, sexual, or classed forms of social harm. We must begin developing theoretical and analytical tools that recognize this social reality. Therefore, social harm can be understood as a primary force in the construction of algorithms of pain, and in turn algorithms of pain shape the experience TLGBQ Latin@s have of social harm. I understand that some conceptual muddiness exists between social harm and algorithms of pain, but the dissertation represents the first major step in articulating the full complexity of each concept and will be continued in future publications.

Algorithms of pain represent both a theoretical and methodological intervention. It is the culmination of my effort to distill a flexible methodological and theoretical tool from all of the TLGBQ Latin@ life stories collected that resisted the impulse for neat explanations and embraced the reality that social life is complex, and therefore necessarily contradictory. I wanted a theory that could not just contend with contradictions between and within participant life stories, but a theory that expected the inevitability of contradictions without assigning a pathological rationale for a contradiction (i.e. stating someone was confused or hypocritical). I would add this flexibility is made possible because algorithms of pain is rooted in and stems from a

social harm framework, which resists narrow constructions of social harm, both in content and context.

TLGBQ Latin@ pain at a systemic level, within sociology or the wider society, is ignored, denied, or outside of the realm of possibility. Algorithms of pain represent my argument that this can no longer remain the status quo within the discipline and within those institutions and organizations responsible for securing collective and individual safety. As mentioned, algorithms of pain does not merely serve as a critique but as a means to move beyond the intractability of those practices and ideologies that serve to erase, minimize, and even justify the pain and suffering of TLGBQ Latin@ people. In the following chapters, the concept of algorithms of pain is further explored in specific and more in-depth dimensions, in the hopes to deepen and flesh out some of the elements and characteristics of the algorithms of pain manifested in the life stories of the twenty-six TLGBQ Latin@ life stories that were entrusted to me.

CHAPTER 2 - Frenemy of the State: Queer Latin@s, the State, and Social Harm

Not surprisingly, TLGBQ Latin@ trust in and relationship to the state, especially in Texas, is a deeply vexed one. Some of my participants, like Danni Guzman, an 18 year-old trans and queer Chicana distrust the law. Danni reveals this antipathy towards the state in her discussion of hate crime laws. When asked to provide her definition of "hate crime" Danni steadfastly responds

> I think it's super romantic in the sense that we love to think of these kind (sic) of Matthew Shepherd instances of queer people being harmed by straight people in really explicit forms. But I think the way that we've – the way that LGBT Community or LG Community has identified hate crime has been super narrowed down in terms of legal legality. And also kind of the way that the violence with crime is committed; it's a specific type of violence. And what I don't like about that is I question the legal approach and I also question the fact that there are more types of violence than this one so called crime. For pretending to qualify it as a hate crime, it has to be someone was murdered or brutally hurt, but also once qualified as some sort of hate crime that you've automatically entered the legal system and everything that the legal system stands for and its consequences, which are to me entirely fucked up.

Danni believes the state's concept of "hate crime" is far too narrow and does not reflect the all too frequent experience of violence by Latin@ TLBGQ people. Implicit to this comment, but more evident during other moments of our conversation, Danni simply does not believe that the state or its actors have her best interest in mind, or that of other TLGBQ Latin@ people. Whereas Danni Guzman expresses an outright distrust and rejection of the state and its activities, actual or potential, Isidro Zapata constructs a different relationship to the state. Isidro is a cisgender Latino gay man in his early fifties when we meet. Isidro does not believe the state as an institution or space comprised of individuals is predisposed to helping or even caring about TLGBQ Latin@s; however he

believes in what he views as the symbolic and practical importance of the law. Isidro tells me

> I think it's [hate crime laws] a good education tool, I think the people need to realize what motivation people have for committing crimes, even hate crimes, and sometimes that can be a crime. Sometimes the motivation can just be a crime – a hate motivation to do that crime. And it's different from just money or anger, sometimes it's just hate, and-and that's a valid reason for some people not a valid reason [for others] but that about acknowledging why people commit crimes.

Unlike Danni, Isidro Zapata believes in the potential of the state and its practical importance in human social life; that if we have laws and a legal system, then it matters what those laws say and do. Danni Guzman's relationship to the state and her resulting evaluation is a function of her negative encounters with state actors, particularly those taking place in school settings and involving the police and security staff of these state institutions. Although Isidro has had similar experiences in school as a youth and with law enforcement agents as an adult, he has many years now worked for the state of Texas. Thus, he is to some degree a representative of the state himself, which might explain in the end his willingness to more readily believe in the importance of and possibility of the law.

Still another participant, Sonia Roman, a 27 year-old light-skinned, cisgender female Chicana lesbian, charts out a third type of relationship to the state. In general, Sonia finds the law relatively important, but is much more selective in how she assigns this meaning. Similar to Danni, Sonia argues the application of hate crime laws is very narrow, mostly a result of police and prosecutorial practice. When I ask Sonia if hate crime laws are important to her she answers "I think they are, but I don't think they're as important to me as laws that promote and demand the execution of equality." For Sonia, anti-discrimination laws, especially her emphasis on effective statutes, is especially important and worthy of her attention and political effort as a Chicana lesbian. Thus, like

Isidro, Sonia believes in the practical importance of the state, and by extension the importance of the law, in the lives of TLGBQ Latin@s. However, the sociopolitical meaning she constructs with the state is not a "blank check," she is very clear in her analysis of what is important to her and likely what should be important to other TLGBQ Latin@s.

Although other participants share Danni Guzman's analysis, they were in the minority. The vast majority of TLGBQ Latin@ people interviewed are more in line with the observations and critiques of both Isidro Zapata and Sonia Roman. It is critical to note that the positions of Sonia and Isidro are not oppositional to Danni's critique in its entirety. All three participants, in fact the whole sample of TLGBQ Latin@s interviewed, share the conclusion that the state is a source of harm in their life. This does not mean that state social harm manifests in the same ways within the life story of each queer Latin@, but there is a consistent experience of or witness to state action or inaction that is detrimental to TLGBQ Latin@ life and safety.

Thus, sitting and listening to nearly thirty TLGBQ Latin@s share their lives, explaining the myriad of ways and times they have felt harmed, threatened, isolated, marginalized, or unsafe, it becomes apparent that the state is omnipresent within their narratives of pain. The place and role of the state in the social harm TLGBQ Latin@s experience is varied and multiple. At times, the social harm is evident in the classic instrumental exercise of state power through its policing activities vis-à-vis local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies. At other times, the role of the state in producing social harm in the lives of TLGBQ Latin@s is not as evident because it facilitates social harm, but may not supply the primary actors in a harmful event.

In spite of its harmful effects, the state can slip outside of analyses of social harm because the activities (e.g. employment) and entities (e.g. schools) involved may not be

traditionally seen or understood as state actions or actors. And yet there are still other times, when the state is rendered invisible in Latin@ TLGBQ narratives of social harm because the state effects harm and pain not through action but through inaction.

Much of our attention regarding the state and the violence or social harm it generates is often focused, understandably, on what many consider the most grievous forms of state violence or social harm, namely physical violence and police profiling (Alexander 2010, Brunson & Miller 2006, Holmes 2000, Jacobs & O'Brien 1998, Menjívar & Rodríguez 2005, Perry 2004, Stewart et al. 2015). I would like to emphasize that focusing on what many would agree are the most extreme forms of state social harm is often necessary, given that such social harm often results in severe and permanent consequences (i.e. irreparable damage to the body, extended periods of incarceration) and in the worst-case situations: loss of life. It is understandable why such manifestations of social harm demand and require our scholarly, political, media, and moral attention. However, as with any focused attention on a particular category of social harm, we run the risk of not fully recognizing the complete array of social dynamics that are providing the context and the formative energy that produces the social harm.

In this chapter, I provide an inventory of the continuum of types of state action in policy areas concerned with social harm to understand state force regarding the total social harm TLGBQ Latin@s encounter and are expected, in large degree, to simply contend with. I trace the myriad of state practices in relevant policy areas to reveal the logic of state function in relation to social harm. I propose that state action and inaction is a management system that regulates, coordinates, condones, and enacts social harm. Mining the rhetoric and practices of the state unveils their larger sociological function as a set of stabilizing acts that legitimize the state and allow for the continued management of social harm rather than a program of eradication and prevention.

As a result of the state's function as a manager of social harm, TLGBQ Latin@ people develop a complicated and often contradictory relationship to the state. This challenging relationship is characterized by mistrust and hope, fear and desire, and pragmatism and idealism. By examining these contradictions I complicate the social meaning queer Latin@s assign to the state that goes beyond the characterization of the state as simply a perpetrator of social harm or the preeminent venue wherein social harm can be addressed. In fact, I argue that located within the representations of the state in TLGBQ Latin@ life stories there is a framework available to identify the constitutive components of justice as it relates to social harm, and begin the very real and necessary work towards social justice. This guiding framework for justice is a product of the practical logic (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992) TLGBQ Latin@s develop through their embodied experiences on the social margins of U.S. society. This practical logic not only reveals the tension that exists between TLGBQ Latin@ people and the state, but also may hold the key to its ultimate resolution.

In this chapter, and throughout the dissertation, I use the term "state" to refer to the sovereign institutional structure most frequently called "the government" in popular discourse. My understanding of the state is not that it represents a unitary entity, and that within the particular context of the U.S. the state is highly segmented and differentiated. Thus the state is both the post office and the Department of Defense, it is the federal, state, and local governments, and from its inception it was designed to maintain systems of power and subordination along race, gender, sexuality, class, and citizenship. I also understand that within the neoliberal paradigm that dominates governmental policies, the state is also represented within those private entities contracted to carry out particular functions once done so directly by the state. Thus, the state is extremely complex and not always readily recognized in all of its forms.

In the introductory chapter, I made the argument for an existing dominant cultural ideology around harm; an ideology that posits harm as inevitable and in many instances beneficial throughout life. In this chapter, I detail the ways this dominant ideology is codified into the U.S. Constitution and federal, state, and local laws and policies. Consequently, this ideology of harm is shaped by prevailing social inequalities, like white supremacy, patriarchy, heterosexism, transphobia, xenophobia, and poverty. It is at the confluence of this cultural ideology of harm and these systems of subordination that state social harm is located and rooted; a space where state action and inaction sanctions overt harm or creates the context where harm is enabled, and where this harm is ultimately distributed disproportionately across many groups, TLGBQ Latin@s being one of them. The exact social processes and mechanisms for how this disproportionality is meted out to various marginalized groups are varied; however, what I argue here is that queer Latin@ communities within Texas, and likely the U.S., remain largely *hyperinvisible* to the daily actions and decision-making of the state and non-governmental state associated organizations (NGSAO) in "anti-violence" or "public safety" work. This *hyperinvisibility* leaves TLGBQ Latin@s as vulnerable subjects and thus an optimal target for all forms of social harm.

SOCIOLOGICAL APPROACHES: FROM LEGITIMATE VIOLENCE TO STATE SOCIAL HARM

Almost a century ago, Max Weber (1919) believed violence was such a critical feature of the state that the very definition of the "state" he employs "is a relation of men dominating men, a relation supported by means of legitimate (i.e. considered to be legitimate) violence. If the state is to exist, the dominated must obey the authority claimed by the powers that be" (Weber 1919, p. 7). According to Weberian theory, the very thing that makes a state a state is the ability for a governmental authority to exercise

its will and desire upon a population in a given territory, and ultimately for the governed to accept this authority as legitimate. Weber (1919) goes on to write

> If no social institutions existed which knew the use of violence, then the concept of 'state' would be eliminated, and a condition would emerge that could be designated as 'anarchy,' in the specific sense of this word. Of course, force is certainly not the normal or the only means of the state – nobody says that – but force is a means specific to the state. Today the relation between the state and violence is an especially intimate one. In the past, the most varied institutions – beginning with the sib – have known the use of physical force as quite normal. Today, however, we have to say that a state is a human community that (successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory. Note that 'territory' is one of the characteristics of the state. Specifically, at the present time, the right to use physical force is ascribed to other institutions or to individuals only to the extent to which the state permits it. The state is considered the sole source of the 'right' to use violence. (p. 7)

Although Weber was writing about the relationship between the modern state and violence almost a hundred years ago, many of his observations hold merit at the present time. When we consider the various contemporary issues relating to physical force: capital punishment; corporal punishment; the legal difference between child abuse and parental disciplinary practice; hate speech; sexual harassment; and penal practices and conditions; all are myriad forms of harm (mostly physical) that claim their legitimacy upon the pronouncements of the state. Even in the cases where there is a theoretical categorical prohibition against certain forms of harm, such as child abuse or sexual harassment, the state still retains definitional authority where certain acts and behaviors fall within the prohibition and others—however ethically wrong—are legally allowed and even justified. Thus, it remains true that within the American state private citizens are able to effect harm against others, including the use of physical force, to a large degree because the state either explicitly sanctions such action or implicitly does so through its silence.

Building from Weber I assert that the state is *one of* the foundational elements that shape individual algorithms of pain throughout the life of TLGBQ Latin@ individuals. Yet, I identify two limitations in a Weberian approach to legitimate state violence. First, he relies on a narrow conception of violence that is almost entirely equated with physical force, and although at moments his analysis implies there are other forms of violence, his work focuses on the instrumental variety.[16] Even though an argument could be made, and at times is appropriate to do so, that physical force is the most egregious form of violence because the consequences can be permanent and irreversible; if the purpose is to catalogue the universe of harms TLGBQ Latin@s encounter throughout their life, then our analysis of the state must move beyond the most explicit forms of state social harm. If we do not account for the full continuum of state social harm, then we can never fully understand the pain and resulting individual and collective decisions TLGBQ Latin@s make. Even more to the point: the full and complex sociological relationship between the state and TLGBQ Latin@s cannot be understood if the methodological and analytical focus is on specific types of state action. I would add this is true not just for TLGBQ Latin@s but for any group.

The problem with Weber's notion of legitimate state violence is that it presents the use of physical force and other social harms by the state as normative[17], even natural; that all residents or citizens within the geographic purview of a nation-state, relatively speaking, are affected by the use of state force in similar, if not generally equal, ways.[18] There exists a strong sociological body of literature that has refuted such notions of relative equality. The state consistently acts disproportionately harmful towards groups along the lines of race (Bonilla-Silva 2001, Drake & Cayton 1945, Feagin 2001, Frazier 1949, Goldberg 2002, Montejano 1987, Omi & Winant 1994, Telles & Ortiz 2008, Wells-Barnett 1895), sex and gender (Connell 1990, Kann 1999, Lister 2003, Orloff

1996, Walby 1989), and class (Korpi & Palme 1998, Mills 1956, Wright 1979). Any analysis of state social harm must be rooted in the sociological realities of white supremacy, patriarchy, heterosexism, transmisogyny, nationalism, capitalism, and globalization. As detailed in the Introduction, social practices are rooted in a cultural economy that is visible in actions and discursive spaces that establishes a foundational ideology, which supports the belief that harm is not only good, but in many instances, necessary. From such ideology emerges "legitimate" state violence. Some bodies receive greater attention and become primary targets for legitimate state violence. Conceiving state violence as legitimate or an expected event maintains the normative framework through which state actions are evaluated and thus prevents the deconstruction and eventual elimination of state practices that reify and replicate social inequalities.

Weber's analysis establishes the modern nation-state and all of its subsidiary components as incorporating violence, unto the point of physical force, as a general and legitimate practice. Although the Weberian tradition takes this observation and creates a normative view of state social harm, it has the simultaneous potential to unseat the contemporary dominant thought that the U.S. nation-state, in particular from the late 20th century to the present, cannot and does not engage in social harm, much less physical force, towards its own citizens with any regularity and the effect of sustaining social inequalities. Weber's challenge to the scholars of his time and to us in the present, is to acknowledge that our modes of conceiving what a state *is* and *does*, is in fact, violence. The very idea of a "state" interweaves violence so seamlessly that it is with rare exception seen as such. When a breakdown in the system is identified, dominant discourse explains such incidents as aberrations of "rogue" officers or governmental agents that is not reflective of the overall system. The "rogue" discourse is especially effective for two reasons. First, in the U.S. federalist system of government, local, state,

and national governments are interconnected yet still maintain fairly specific and separate roles and obligations. Therefore, the very structure of the state lends itself to explanations of a social harm event (when the public recognizes something as such) as being "isolated" and "unusual." Secondly, the post-civil rights period[19]--especially in the so-called "post-racial" era since the election, inauguration, and re-election of President Barack Obama--is marked by the dominant and popular belief that Black economic and political progress, and minorities in general, is in large part a result of the enforcement of civil rights legislation, and any remaining measurable social inequalities are due to Black cultural pathology (Glazer 1975 & 1983, Mead 1986 & 1993, Steele 1990, Thernstrom & Thernstrom 1997). This belief paired with others, such as the declining significance of race and the greater importance of class status, (Wilson 1978 & 1987) and the general effectiveness of U.S. representative democracy to protect the interests and rights of minoritized groups, works well with the "rogue" discourse as a racialized logic that often renders at the very least state social harm invisible to critique and reform and in the worst cases provides an explicit sanctioning of the social harm. Weber's conceptualization of the relationship between the theoretical and functional notions of the state with violence provide the intellectual space that creates the potential for a *critical moment* (Glisch-Sanchez 2014) that can dislodge the taken-for-granted knowledges of the social and professional fields we inhabit (Bourdieu 1990).

This chapter builds upon the Weberian view of the modern state by understanding that one of the primary functions of governments is to maintain domination over a population within geo-political boundaries through the empowerment of a socio-political elite via the administrative and bureaucratic mechanisms of the state, which includes instrumental violence through police and military forces. That the dominated national population is often segmented along ethnoracial (Goldberg 2002), gendered, sexual,

class, disability, and legal-status lines as a means to streamline and organize state social harm. That the state social harm a government engages in is usually held beyond reproach because either the action/inaction of the state is deemed legitimate in-and-of-itself or because the communities and bodies targeted at any given point are sufficiently marginalized within the mainstream body politic. Where I differ is my understanding of the role of social identities—such as race, gender, sexuality, class, and citizenship—in the work and business of the state. Social harm as a framework explicitly rejects the normativity found in Weberian analysis and the nihilistic view that conflicts, especially those rooted in white supremacy, heteropatriarchy and the like, are inevitable and permanent.

In addition to Weber, Michel Foucault has greatly influenced sociological thought on violence and the state. Foucault begins by contesting hierarchical notions of power. He (1980) writes

> To pose the problem in terms of the State means to continue posing it in terms of sovereign and sovereignty, that is to say in terms of law. If one describes all these phenomena of power as dependent on the State apparatus, this means grouping them as essentially repressive…I don't want to say that the State isn't important; what I want to say is that relations of power, and hence the analysis that must be made of them necessarily extend beyond the limits of the State…because the State, for all of the omnipotence of its apparatuses, is far from being able to occupy the whole field of actual power relations, and further because the State can only operate on the basis of other, already existing power relations. The State is superstructural in relation to a whole series of power networks that invest the body, sexuality, the family, kinship, knowledge, technology, and so forth. (p. 122).

Thus, Foucault's criticism is in large part rooted in his conceptualization of power, which is:

> conceived to be relational, something that is exercised from a variety of points in the social body…power is not conceived to be imposed from the apex of a social hierarchy, nor derived from a foundational binary opposition between a ruling and

> ruled class, rather it operates in a capillary fashion from below. Thus confrontations in the form of massive binary divisions constitute merely a temporary and exceptional state of accumulation of the multiplicity of cleavages and resistances arising from the plurality of power relations in the social body. (Smart 2002, p. 119)

The focus on the state's law enforcement/security apparatus, according to Foucault, displaces and renders invisible the everydayness of power's effects in shaping individuality itself, and ultimately shaping choices, decisions, and behaviors. Foucault would not argue that the state has no place in discussions of power, but that it should not serve as the dominant locus of an analysis and understanding of power.[20] As a result, he develops his concepts of *discipline* and *governmentality*, which along with sovereignty constitute a triad of ways his relations of power manifest.

His concept of disciplinary power illustrates how power relations construct 'normal' subjects, but more importantly how these normalizing tenets are inhabited and enforced by the very bodies they are meant to control. Key to Foucault's disciplinary power is the presence of micro-penalties and rewards that do not require the heavy-handedness of the state's sovereign power. Governmentality is the second major concept Foucault develops to describe the micro-sociological functioning of power; governmentality seeks control via the promise of life, what he deemed *biopolitics*. Thus, governmentality operates with the logic that if individuals, communities, and populations act within certain parameters they shall be able to survive.

Foucault uses state institutions as the primary sites to theorize discipline and governmentality. He uses the prison, through the ideal type of the Panopticon, to describe the micro-sociological processes that produce disciplinary power; and governmental public health practices as an example of pushing governed populations to adopt self-regulatory practices regarding sexuality. It is important to note that Foucault's idea of power is a form of social harm because power is the ability to take life, give life, and "to

structure the field of action of others" (Foucault 1982, p. 790). But also, power is productive. It produces individuals.

Any theory or framework attempting to understand or explain state social harm in the lives of TLGBQ Latin@s, I maintain, must hold onto the tension between macro- and micro-sociological levels since it is decisions and dynamics occurring in both that affect queer Latin@s and result in trauma and pain. Concepts like discipline and governmentality provide a model of how to locate the presence of the state in spaces that are not explicitly defined as such. The realms of the family and sexuality are prime examples of spaces that in some respects are considered the antithesis of the state (i.e. private vs. public domains), but are shaped in important ways even when state actors are not literally present. Such an analytical gaze begins to provide the tools through which we can observe state inaction; state inaction is one of the most important forms of state social harm in the life stories of Latin@ TLGBQ people.

As useful as some elements of Foucauldian theory are they still fall short in being able to capture the full complexity and material realities of TLGBQ Latin@s in the United States, especially in Texas. Foucault's theory of power is decoupled from social formations such race, gender, class, citizenship, disability, and even sexuality[21]. Foucauldian theory holds that power operates and is exerted from many social localities and positions and rejects the notion of binary power relations, of those subordinate and those superordinate. Where large disparities and inequalities exist between two groups it represents the accumulation of various techniques of power; power is not centralized solely within the state, but there are many loci of power dispersed throughout the structure of human social life. Any model or analysis of power in the United States must incorporate the historical and contemporary realities of social inequality; that power flows *consistently* and *prodigiously* towards the benefit of individuals that occupy

particular categories of social membership: cisgender, male, white, elite, and heterosexual. The greater number of these categories an individual occupies, then the greater overall accumulation of benefit is possible; while the fewer the categories a person inhabits, then less power and its associated privileges are directed toward their benefit and instead to their detriment.

Sexual- and gender-nonconforming Latin@s live on the margins of U.S. society (Acosta 2013, Anzaldúa 1987, Ayala 2010, Calvo & Esquibel 2010, Cantú 2009, Decena 2011, Guzmán 2006, Ochoa 2010, Peña 2013, Trujillo 1991). The inequality TLGBQ Latin@s face is not merely ideological, discursive, and interpersonal, but also material and structural. Neither governmentality nor disciplinary power are adequate in explaining the historical processes of entrapment, displacement, enslavement, genocide, sexual violence and the prevalent neoliberal politics that have heightened the precarity of everyday life for Latin@s. Despite creating some useful analytical space to capture state social harm, by not incorporating the material components the form racialized gender and sexuality, Foucault misses all the dimensions of state social harm and trauma in Latin@ queer lives. The intractable marginality that Latin@ queer people experience historically and contemporarily indicates the presence of what Patricia Hill Collins (2000) terms a *matrix of domination*,[22] a phenomenon and reality Foucault's work simply does not recognize.

In his essay (2004) in the seminal anthology *Beyond Criminology: Taking Harm Seriously*, Tony Ward theorizes for the merits of incorporating a social harm framework to activities and behaviors of the state. Ward utilizes the phrase "state harm" and defines it as "an invasion by a state agency of any person's basic welfare interests, whether such invasion is justified or not" (Ibid., p. 86). He differentiates the concept of state harm from state crime; the latter "is a form of organisational deviance involving human rights

violations by state agencies" (Ibid., p. 84). For an action to be labeled deviant it must be considered a breach of an important social norm or ethic that requires some form of punishment and/or accountability. A state's actions or inactions that harm TLGBQ Latin@s are often not seen as deviant because the subordination of TLGBQ Latin@s creates the conditions wherein their suffering is *the* norm and requires no form of intervention. This can be said for most subordinated populations, especially those that embody multiple categories of marginalization.[23]

State harm, according to Ward, has the benefit of centering the experiences and knowledge of victims of state aggression and neglect. Similarly, Paul Iganski (2008) has called for a "victim-centred" approach in the understanding and construction of 'hate crimes,' which suffer from much of the same limitations Ward recounts for state crime. For both Ward (2004) and Iganski (2008), the key to centering victims' experiences is first allowing their encounters with pain, hurt, and trauma to delineate the boundaries for what should be analyzed and critiqued under the rubric of state or hate crime. I would add that any victim-centered approach must contend with all of the harm a victim experiences, including those traumas and pain that remain implied and in the background of queer Latin@ narratives of harm and not just those articulated at the conscious level. The state infiltrates Latin@ TLGBQ lives in a myriad of complex ways, and as a result its presence manifests in a diversity of modes in their life story accounts.

I argue that Ward does not go far enough, and in one-sense replicates the very problem he critiques. Ward's concept of "state harm" turns entirely on what is considered a "basic welfare interest," which he describes as the following:

> these are interests in those elements of freedom and wellbeing that are necessary for human beings to function effectively as purposive agents…They include such things as life, physical and mental health, freedom from severe pain, freedom

> from confinement or coercion, and sufficient education and financial resources to enable one to play a part in the life of one's society. (p. 85)

Ward makes the assumption that a general consensus can be attained regarding "basic welfare interests," unfortunately that might be putting the proverbial cart before the horse. It would be hard to locate a significant portion of the general public that would disagree with the idea that every human being's basic welfare should be provided for and protected, however such notions are easy to agree to in the abstract. TLGBQ Latin@ bodies and identities are rooted in unequal power relations and therefore are targets for racial, gendered, sexual, classed, and xenophobic social harm. TLGBQ Latin@s are consistently subjected to discourses of what Presser (2013) refers to as "reducing the Other" (p. 22). Such reductions constantly rationalize why social harm impacting TLGBQ Latin@s is not only acceptable, but even beneficial to the body politic as a whole and even potentially helpful for TLGBQ Latin@s themselves. Therefore, linking the concept and analytical lens of *state social harm* to breaches of basic welfare undermines the truly transformative possibilities of a genuinely victim-centered praxis.

Essential to any theory that seeks to reverse this trend is the need to center TLGBQ Latin@ lives, experiences, and thought. Queer Latin@s are not a monolithic group that speak with a single political voice, but putting individual TLGBQ Latin@ life stories in conversation with one another it is possible to identify similarities and differences and the socio-political contexts that help produce them. Additionally, stakeholder interviews and state documents that investigate the array of state programs, policies, and practices regarding various types of social harm bring into focus an underlying ideology regarding harm and violence that permeates the whole super structure of the state. The concept of *state social harm* in conjunction with *harm management* achieves this objective.

THE STATE AS HARM MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION

As illustrated in the previous chapter, TLGBQ Latin@s encounter tremendous levels of social harm, both individually, and collectively. Some of those harms are directly perpetrated by the state, while others by non-state actors. The degree of social harm that TLGBQ Latin@s are subjected to raises the questions: why are policy prescriptions that are meant to deal with various forms of harm, including social harm, so ineffective at protecting queer Latin@s? Why is the state simultaneously so present and absent in TLGBQ Latin@ pain and trauma? One could simply answer these questions by pointing out the various ways the U.S. nation-state in general espouses racist, heteropatriarchal, transmisogynist, xenophobic, and class exploitative ideologies and practices. Although this may be self-evident it does not provide the critical knowledge of *how* the state is able to accomplish both in the present historical period, in particular how it maintains such a dynamic specifically for TLGBQ Latin@s. The research for this dissertation has been conducted at a very peculiar time for queer Latin@s; a time marked by incredible interest in Latin@ communities for reasons pertaining to immigration and U.S. electoral politics, and substantial attention to TLGBQ civil rights in the form of marriage rights and workplace discrimination. One might expect as a result of this dynamic that TLGBQ Latin@s would receive significant, maybe even potentially helpful, consideration from the state, but quite the opposite is true.

A tension exists between the pluralistic post-civil rights era democratic discourse agents of the state and private individuals engage in and the *empirical* sociological function and dynamics that are the relationship between the state and social harm. It is this tension that this section is attempting to tease out. I argue that despite clear prohibitions of whole categories of social harm, state apparatuses that are designed and implemented to carry out these bans on types of social harm cannot and do not begin to

approach their stated goals of prevention and elimination. Therefore, the *de facto* sociological function of these state regimes comprised of laws, regulations, executive and law enforcement agencies, court cases, and NGSAOs[24] is that of *harm management*. Thus, the state's philosophy and functional design can best be understood as a *harm management organization* (HMO).

The importance of recognizing the state as a harm management organization is rooted in the institutionalized contradiction between the categorical and absolute prohibitions against many social harms (e.g. hate crimes, employment and housing discrimination, child abuse, rape, and domestic violence) and state practices implemented to enforce codified prohibitions. To be clear, this observation and critique is not that the state engages in management activities of any kind, I do not deny the realities that the state must coordinate the use of limited resources in order to receive the proverbial "biggest bang for your buck." However, I would add that the limited resources of which I speak is less financial limitations, but rather, human capital in terms of labor-hours and expertise and knowledge to address and prevent various social harms. A government's budget is a moral document that is an expression of political will.[1] The point is clear: a state entity will always find the necessary financial resources to pursue its most valued activities.

My argument is leveled at the state's ontological orientation toward social harm vis-à-vis its organizational and programmatic structures. When the state is observed in its totality—what it says, doesn't say, does, and doesn't do—it becomes apparent that the state ontologically positions itself as a manager of harm. I emphasize the state's ontology because ways of being are almost never conscious realizations. My use of harm

[1] Dr. Joseph Heim, pers. Comm.

management organization—besides being a riff on health management organization—is an attempt to update and bring Weber's century old argument of violence and the state into contemporary analyses of the state, public policies, and minoritized populations. Weber's observation was essentially an ontological one regarding not only the state's use of violence but also how governed populations often view such violence as legitimate.

Through TLGBQ Latin@ life stories, stakeholder interviews, and state documents—court decisions, statutes, manuals, brochures, reports—I document the state's ontology towards social harm. This ontological stance, what I call *harm management*, represents the institutionalization of a specific algorithm of pain. It is an algorithm of pain that does not recognize queer Latin@ suffering which encompasses fear, rage, hurt, anxiety, and sadness. This institutionalization is achieved through codified language, adjudicated events, programmatic objectives, and organizational cultures. The fundamental elements of this institutionalized algorithm of pain is white supremacy, patriarchy, homophobia, transmisogyny, xenophobia, and capitalism. The process of harm management that the state practices is a locus for the production of social harm; wherein harm is not random and individuals, groups, and populations do not share the same probability of being harmed.

The following sections present the data that outline the major characteristics of a *harm management organization*.

Institutionalized Contradictions

One of the central elements of an ontological structure predicated upon *harm management* is the seeming contradiction among stated goals and objectives of state entities, and those between them and the institutional and organizational activities marshaled to achieve them. As Weberian theory explains, state violence is often

perceived as a legitimate force, but in a pluralistic democracy legitimacy can only be achieved if state violence is accompanied by a discourse of safeguarding the bodies and interests of the general public, especially those granted formal citizenship. Messaging about crime and punishment, national security, personal responsibility, oversight and regulation, and parental rights all stem from this discourse that position the state as the pre-eminent entity to prevent, eliminate, and address a panoply of social harms and protect a litany of civil liberties and private property. It is the observation of the dissonance of this discourse and state practices that allows us to peer beyond the superficial social veil and observe the dynamic that constitutes harm management.

Vision and mission statements are administrative assertions designed to capture an organization's purpose, value(s), ethics, and/or methods of operation. Because these statements are guiding principles in deciding what activities an organization should engage in, they provide a useful metric for evaluating the effectiveness of an organization's efforts. Additionally, the statements provide helpful indicators of how institutions/organizations view and understand the social world they inhabit and serve. In Table 2.1 I provide the list of federal agencies and their stated missions to illustrate my point.

Table 2.1: Institutionalized Contradictions & Federal Vision/Mission Statements; all language is copied from each department's and agency's website.

FEDERAL DEPT/AGENCY	VISION/MISSION LANGUAGE
Dept. of Justice (DoJ)	"to ensure public safety against threats foreign and domestic; to provide federal leadership in preventing and controlling crime; …and to ensure fair and impartial administration of justice for all Americans."
Civil Rights Division	"works to uphold the civil and constitutional rights of all Americans, particularly some of the most vulnerable members of our society. The Division enforces federal statutes prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, disability, religion, familial status and national origin."

Table 2.1: continued

Project Safe Childhood	"a unified and comprehensive strategy to combat child exploitation…The goal of Project Safe Childhood is to reduce the incidence of sexual exploitation of children."
Office on Violence Against Women	"provide federal leadership in developing the national capacity to reduce violence against women and administer justice for and strengthen services to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking."
Dept. Health & Human Services (HHS)	"is the U.S. government's principal agency for protecting the health of all Americans and providing essential human services, especially for those who are least able to help themselves."
Administration for Children & Families	"Children, youth, families, individuals and communities who are resilient, safe, healthy, and economically secure. To foster health and well-being by providing federal leadership, partnership and resources for the compassionate and effective delivery of human services"
Family Violence Prevention & Services Program	"administers the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (FVPSA), the primary federal funding stream dedicated to the support of emergency shelter and related assistance for victims of domestic violence and their children"
Dept. of Housing & Urban Deve. (HUD)	"to create strong, sustainable, inclusive communities and quality affordable homes for all…build inclusive and sustainable communities free from discrimination"
Dept. of Homeland Security (DHS)	"to ensure a homeland that is safe, secure, and resilient against terrorism and other hazards."
U.S. Customs & Border Protection	"We are the guardians of our nation's borders. We are America's frontline. We safeguard the American homeland at and beyond our borders…We serve the American public with vigilance, integrity and professionalism."
U.S. Immigration & Customs Enforcement	"is to promote homeland security and public safety through the criminal and civil enforcement of federal laws governing border control, customs, trade and immigration…Immigration enforcement is the largest single area of responsibility for ICE."
Dept. of Labor (DoL)	"To foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners, job seekers, and retirees of the United States; improve working conditions; advance opportunities for profitable employment; and assure work-related benefits and rights."
Wage and Hour Division	"The WHD enforces Federal minimum wage, overtime pay, recordkeeping, and child labor requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act. WHD also enforces the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act…and a number of employment standards and worker protections as provided in several immigration related statutes."
Women's Bureau	"Women in the workforce are vital to the nation's economic security. The Women's Bureau develops policies and standards and conducts inquiries to safeguard the interests of working women; to advocate for their equality and economic security for themselves and their families; and to promote quality work environments."

Table 2.1: continued

Dept. of Education (DEd)	"to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access."
Office of Civil Rights	"Administer the provisions of legislation and Departmental policy prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, handicap, or age…Conduct investigations and negotiations to secure voluntary compliance and conduct administrative enforcement proceedings to secure compliance with legislative and regulatory civil rights requirements."
Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement for Limited English Proficient Students	"establishes and implements policy and national dissemination efforts of the bilingual education programs that serve the limited English proficient (LEP) children and adults…Build and/or enhance local education agency (LEA) capacity to provide an education of high quality to LEP and language minority students."
White House Initiative on Educational Excellence for Hispanics	"strengthening the Nation by expanding educational opportunities and improving educational outcomes for Hispanics of all ages, and helping ensure that all Hispanics receive an education that properly prepares them for college, productive careers, and satisfying lives."

To this end, Table 2.1 presents language from the vision/mission statements of six federal departments and a selection of their subsidiary units. I focus on the executive branch because, of the three, it is the one tasked with carrying out the overwhelming majority of the state's governing responsibilities. I focus on the six departments listed because they are the primary responsible state actors in the areas of public safety, crime, civil rights, education, employment, housing, healthcare, poverty, and immigration; all themes and topics arising in the life stories of TLGBQ Latin@ participants, but in general are major issues for both Latin@ and TLGBQ populations in the United States (Krogstad 2014, Egan, Edelman & Sherrill 2008).

Several important patterns are apparent in the language of the mission statements these highest-level organizational executive units; First, all six departments specify the particular harms that the department is tasked with preventing, or controlling. The DoJ is meant to prevent crime and corruption/bias in the administration of justice, HHS is assigned the duty of providing a social safety net "for those who are least able to help

themselves," HUD is charged with building "communities free from discrimination," DoL is intended to "promote…the welfare of the wage earners, job seekers, and retirees of the United States…and assure work-related benefits and rights," and lastly, the DEd is supposed to "to promote student achievement…by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access." In large part the major function of these departments is to address in a substantial manner the social harms affecting those living within the United States, especially it's citizens. These stated goals are made using adamant language, using words like "ensure" and "assure" to denote these objectives as promised outcomes. Such language implies that the majority, if not the entirety, of the department's activities will be geared towards the accomplishment of the goals and objectives within the mission/vision statements; additionally, that resources—in all of their forms—shall be dispensed accordingly.

Similar promissory language is incorporated in the mission statements of sub-Departmental offices, agencies, and programs, but less frequently. The Office of Civil Rights (OCR) under the DoJ states its purpose as to "uphold the civil and constitutional rights of all Americans, particularly some of the most vulnerable members of our society." Within OCR's mission statement there is an explicit recognition that there are people and groups who are vulnerable in having their civil and constitutional rights denied. This is not an isolated instance; other mission statements, such as organizations with HHS recognize the existence of social inequality too, yet neither OCR nor HHS identifies who constitutes those vulnerable groups. The problem with groups or classes of people not being listed is that the state then is free to define it in any way they choose and it is harder to then hold it accountable to achieve needed results. It is interesting to note that the Office of Civil Rights for the DEd does not incorporate the same or similar language as the OCR in DoJ.

This brings me to my next point about the devolution of promissory language and the rise of bureaucratic, legalistic, technical, and incremental language. When we look in Table 2.1 at administrative units directly below Departmental status,[25] we observe a shift in the language used and discourse created regarding social harm and pain. The DoJ, HHS, and other Departments use promissory language that utilizes a vocabulary that is designed to signify an absolute commitment to altruistic principles and outcomes. These missions speak to "fair and impartial administration of justice for all," "protecting the health of all Americans," "create strong, sustainable, inclusive communities and quality affordable homes for all," "foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners, job seekers, and retirees of the United States," and "equal access" in education. This language embodies critical principles, values, and goals that stand in clear opposition to social harm as a consistent social phenomenon and dynamic in the United States. According to Table 2.1, second tier administrative units contain virtually none of this value-laden, principle-oriented, and inspirational language in their mission statements.

To properly appreciate the significance of this change, it is important to note that the sub-departmental units are just below Department designation and represent major programmatic and regulatory activities of their respective departmental homes. Thus, this shift is neither gradual nor relatively hidden, it is immediate and sudden, an institutionalized contradiction in plain view. Gone almost entirely are references to altruistic principles, replaced by a vocabulary supporting incremental social change that ultimately only serves to reify and replicate white supremacy, patriarchy, heterosexism, transmisogyny, class exploitation, and xenophobia. For example, the mission statements of these units are peppered with language referring to activities for the purpose of "reduc[ing]" social harm, enforcing statutory "requirements" and "standards," "conducting inquiries," "advocate" on behalf, and "secur[ing] voluntary compliance."

One of the best examples of the institutionalized contradictions that are central to harm management is the Family Violence Prevention & Services Program (FVPSP) of HHS. The mission statement explains the Program

> administers the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (FVPSA), the primary federal funding stream dedicated to the support of emergency shelter and related assistance for victims of domestic violence and their children

Although the term "prevention" is utilized in the program's name and is repeated again in the mission by referencing the unit's namesake and authorizing legislation, the mission does not ever clearly stipulate that a goal of the program is to prevent or eliminate family violence in the United States. Rather, the FVPSP's function is very narrowly constructed in bureaucratic terms. It is the means through which the federal government "supports" emergency services for victims of domestic violence and their children. Funding emergency services for those most directly affected by family violence is a laudable effort, but it does not accomplish the implied goal of *preventing* this form of violence. Emergency services by definition are activities that *respond* to family violence. I would also point to the fact that FVPSP and most likely the authorizing statute construct victims of family violence as an adult custodial parent; children discursively reside outside of the category of victim. One might argue that the Family Violence Prevention & Services Program is designed to specifically support adult victims and relegate the support of children to another administrative unit. Yet, the agencies are split; while FVPSP is a part of HHS, Project Safe Childhood (PSC) is a unit of the DoJ. By the name of the project, one might assume they address an array of issues that impact safety during childhood and adolescence. Again, this assumption is not unreasonable, however, the PSC's mission (see Table 2.1) stipulates that the goal is to reduce the sexual exploitation of children. Unfortunately, sexual exploitation is not the only threat to a child's safety; it

may not even be the greatest threat. It remains unclear what administrative unit, if any, under the DoJ or HHS is responsible for aiding child victims of family violence. To reiterate, neither the FVPSP nor the PSC are able to prevent the social harm affecting adult and child victims of family and sexual violence. PSC straightforwardly declares its mission is not to prevent, but rather to reduce. Not only does this contradict DoJ promises to guarantee public safety and prevent crime, but implicit to the concept of reduction means the system has tolerance for the presence of the element it is ostensibly attempting to reduce. Thus, even in its narrow focus of child sexual exploitation, the PSC's discourse allows for the presence and continuation of child sexual violence.

Even just in terms of the FVPSP and PSC, the questions of what it would take to realize a near complete elimination of family violence and childhood sexual exploitation is incredibly important for the safety of TLGBQ Latin@s. Over two-thirds of my respondents shared at least one example, usually several, of family violence, either as a child, adult, or both. Additionally, one third of TLGBQ Latin@s I interviewed spoke about being victims and survivors of sexual abuse as children, indicating at the very least that these forms of social harm are of concern and in need of immediate attention for a significant proportion of the larger queer Latin@ population in the U.S. Thus, it is problematic that the very state organizational units designed to deal with these very specific forms of social harm do not engage in enforcement and prevention activities, nor do they construct guiding mission statements that would motivate or require a change in practices.

I argue that the contradiction between the mission statements of executive departments and the daily activities of their administrative units is so large that no reasonable expectation can exist that any substantial progress towards their principled goals of eliminating or preventing social harm will or can occur. An example of this is

found in my interview with George Gibbons, the director of a municipal equal employment and fair housing office. The federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission along with the Fair Housing Administration in HUD, often contract with municipal and state agencies to do intake, process, and investigate claims of federally prohibited discriminatory actions. This is the case with George's office, and thus he operates as both a federal and municipal agent in this context. In the interview I inquired specifically about TLGBQ Latin@s and discrimination

David: Do you think that Latinas, and Latinos who are transgender, lesbian, gay bisexuals or queer encounter unique challenges as it relates to discrimination?

George: No, and I guess to explain I would say that each individual's experience is unique, and, you know, to keep, I mean to sort of reduce it to not favoring or disfavoring any group I'll just say that, you know, ethnic backgrounds Hispanic is one. There can be any number of other ethnic backgrounds, and I'll say, you know, let's say there's one through five plus Hispanic, and you know, alternative sexual orientation, gender identity status, alternative from traditional. You can have an individual with a traditional sexual orientation gender identity, and ethnic category number three, whose experience is unique, just as unique as a Latino, Latina transgendered person depending upon the individual interaction with the employment manager or the housing provider or the provider of a public accommodation. Each interaction is unique, I think that human interactions are unique; in fact the law of discrimination acknowledges that a person of race number two can discriminate against another person of race number two. It's not a defense to a complaint by a person of race number two that the person who took the action was also of race number two, the same race therefore, it can't be discrimination, the law does not recognize that principle and, so people can discriminate against their own kind, and it is because of in my opinion that's how people relate, the interactions are unique. I think that often times these discussions of discrimination move toward talking about groups as groups. In my experience, you can't talk about groups as groups; you can't say that this group is biased against this different group. The group is individuals, and the other group is individuals, and you have to look at those interactions individually.

George articulates a very strict colorblind and identity-neutral ideology of anti-discrimination law and enforcement. For George, discrimination is found exclusively within one-on-one interactions between individuals, interactions that, in his words, entirely "unique." George adamantly states that the investigation of interactions should not incorporate knowledge about historical and contemporary social dynamics, insinuating that they have no bearing on whether discrimination is present in an interaction between two people, let along a legal determination of prohibited behavior. Such an understanding of the letter and spirit of the law runs in contradiction to EEOC, HUD, and DoJ mission statements acknowledging the existence of vulnerable members of society.

Some will argue that it is unreasonable to expect the federal government to achieve substantial reduction in social harm, much less its complete prevention. They would argue that the federal government is not best situated to address the majority of types of social harm; that given the federalist structure[26] of the U.S. form of government, states are logistically better situated and constitutionally designated to deal with the majority of social harm. I will address the latter point a little later, so let me first address the former.

During the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 it was argued that a government cannot legislate what is in a person's heart; that governmental prohibitions can only go so far in legislating private behavior. To adherents of this logic, it is entirely unsurprising that the state is incapable of addressing various forms of social harm, such as child abuse, racist and transphobic street harassment, sexist promotional practices, intimate partner violence, and homophobic emotional neglect. It is unsurprising because the harm is predicated upon some form of bias and legislative and executive fiat cannot banish individual or group interpersonal bias. It is true that statutory prohibitions cannot

in and of themselves prevent social harm, however this does not prove that an effective enforcement and prevention strategy cannot exist that addresses, eliminates, and prevents social harm.

There are several areas where the U.S. has realized the goals of elimination and prevention and continue to do so; none more so than in public health and national security. The U.S. government, along with members of the medical community, has virtually eliminated a whole host of infectious diseases that a generation or two ago were a common fact of life. Widespread vaccination programs and significant investments in advanced sanitation systems and hygiene campaigns at the turn of the 20th century and continuing throughout led to the virtual eradication of diseases like polio, influenza, tuberculosis, measles, rubella, smallpox, typhoid fever, malaria, tetanus and dysentery. Such public health campaigns are massive feats that entail effective medical intervention (i.e. vaccines, water treatment facilities, etc.) and effective public campaigns that help change behavior, attitudes, and ideas. It is easy to accept these results as an historical inevitability, but at the time of their development and implementation much doubt surrounded the ability to actually achieve this level of success. The other area of success, controversially so, is national security. Given the U.S.' global presence and its neocolonial policies and practices, it has become a target for large-scale violent attacks. In recent history there have been several attacks carried out successfully, the bombings of the World Trade Center in 1993, the *U.S.S. Cole*, embassies in Tanzania and Kenya, and most notably the 9/11 attacks. Given how regularly these types of attacks occurred in the 1990's and early 2000's, it is a bit surprising that no other comparable major attacks have occurred on U.S. soil or against U.S. assets. Presumably, this is the result of intensified "anti-terror" activities of the U.S. government. I make this latter observation not as a means to condone or support in any way the many violent and anti-civil rights and

liberties programs and tactics the U.S. government has employed. *The argument I am making is that there are historic and contemporary examples of federal strategies, policies, and practices that have realized in actuality or nearly so their goals of eliminating specific harms and threats that are complex and dynamic in nature, much like any form of social harm*.[27] Lastly, I would make the observation that the limited successes we have realized in terms of racial, gender, and class justice have been through federal interventions via court decisions (*Brown v. Board of Education* and *Roe v. Wade*) and legislative action and executive implementation (*Voting Rights Act of 1965* and the *Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990*). Given this reality, the federal government has a legitimate role in any effort to prevent and eliminate social harm.

As mentioned earlier, it is true that legal jurisdiction to address many forms of social harm has been ceded to state and local governments. Types of social harm that are relegated exclusively to state and local governments include: child abuse, sexual violence, most forms of hate crimes, school harassment, street intimidation, police brutality, and emotional neglect and abuse. It is also true that not all states are the same, for instance some states and municipalities have passed anti-bullying policies to address the epidemic of school-based harassment, but most states and localities have no policies or laws regarding this form of social harm. Thus, the role and function in social harm of state and municipal governments for TLGBQ Latin@s may change and be dependent on the specific geopolitical context. It is beyond the scope of this study to assess which states or municipalities may be more adept at aiding TLGBQ Latin@s by preventing, eliminating, or even substantially reducing social harm. However, this project is well situated to evaluate the state of Texas, the social context for my research participants. In Table 2.2 I provide information on Texas agencies and their mission statements.

Table 2.2: Institutionalized Contradictions & Texas State Vision/Mission Statements; all language is copied from each department's website.

TEXAS DEPT/AGENCY	VISION/MISSION LANGUAGE
Dept. of Public Safety (TDPS)	"Protect and Serve Texas…Proactively protect the citizens of Texas in an ever changing threat environment while always remaining faithful to the U.S. and State Constitution…Combat Crime and Terrorism"
Dept. of Criminal Justice (TDCJ)	"manages offenders in state prisons, state jails and private correctional facilities that contract with TDCJ. The agency also provides funding and certain oversight of community supervision…and is responsible for the supervision of offenders released from prison on parole or mandatory supervision."
Dept. of Family & Protective Services (TDFPS)	"The mission of The Texas Department of Family and Protective Services is to protect children, the elderly, and people with disabilities from abuse, neglect, and exploitation by involving clients, families, and communities."
Dept. of State Health Services (TDSHS)	"To improve health and well-being in Texas."
Dept. of Housing & Community Affairs (TDHCA)	"to administer its assigned programs efficiently, transparently, and lawfully and to invest its resources strategically and develop high quality affordable housing which allows Texas communities to thrive."
Texas Workforce Commission (TWC)	"To promote and support a workforce system that creates value and offers employers, individuals, and communities the opportunity to achieve and sustain economic prosperity…We believe that the workforce system of Texas must be market-driven, meeting the needs of employers and workers, for Texas to continue as a leader in the global market. We believe that individuals must assume personal responsibility for making decisions about their lives and be accountable for their actions."
Civil Rights Division	"Civil Rights programs provide investigations of employment or housing discrimination complaints, training and technical assistance to public and private entities, personnel policy reviews of state agencies and institutions of higher education, and reviews of initial testing conducted by fire departments…The Civil Rights Division's programs provide an avenue to file a complaint for individuals who believe they have been discriminated against in an employment or housing transaction. In order to file a complaint, the individual should meet the jurisdictional requirements of the appropriate statute."

Table 2.2: continued

Texas Education Agency (TEA)	"provide leadership, guidance, and resources to help schools meet the educational needs of all students and prepare them for success in the global economy…respects the primacy of local control so that the most important decisions are made as close as possible to students, schools, and communities."

Texas is socially, politically, and economically conservative.[28] As a state there is broad, yet, contested support for the principles of *laissez-faire* economics, free-market solutions to social problems, individual responsibility, limited government, and the centrality of the family and traditional gender roles to social life. Such ideological tenets produce a specific type of state regime that opts for a very limited role in eliminating or preventing social harm; Table 2.2 illustrates this very point. The TDHCA, TWC, and TEA incorporate the aforementioned conservative principles most explicitly in their mission statements; with references to efficiency, resource investment, personal responsibility and accountability, and the "primacy of local control." Unlike HUD (see Table 2.1), the TDHCA makes no reference to eliminating housing discrimination; in fact, TDHCA just argued (January 21, 2015) before the U.S. Supreme Court in *Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs, et al. v. Inclusive Communities Project, Inc.* that disparate impact[29] claims under the Fair Housing Act are unconstitutional. In this case, Inclusive Communities Project, Inc. (ICP) made a claim that the TDHCA was engaging in a systematic redlining practice that maintains racial segregation by allocating Low-Income Housing Tax Credits to housing developments in predominantly minority communities; both the trial and appellate courts affirmed ICP's claim and determined that TDHCA was in violation of the Fair Housing Act. This case is an excellent example of the harm management function of the state. A management system both allows and disallows certain activities, the dominant ideology around harm requires that interventions be made to prevent social harm from time to time in order to maintain the

legitimacy of the system, in this case the state. TDHCA on one hand is attempting to reduce the social harm of insufficient affordable housing through leveraging tax credits, but it does so, on the other hand, by replicating and maintaining the social harm of de facto racial housing segregation. Thus, this harm management practice is rooted in the institutionalized contradiction between TDHCA's mission to "develop high quality affordable housing which allows Texas communities to thrive" and the developed strategy and practice of assigning low-income housing tax credits primarily to developers building in predominantly racial minority neighborhoods.

Similarly, unlike the DoL and the DoJ, the TWC in its mission makes no mention of discrimination or fair labor practices. Instead, emphasis is placed on their effort to "[create] value and [offer] employers, individuals, and communities the opportunity to achieve and sustain economic prosperity." Employers are the TWC's priority, not workers; notice the use of "individuals" instead of the more apt "employee," "worker," or "laborer." TWC makes explicit that all workforce related policies must be grounded in the principles of free markets and individual responsibility; in fact, the TWC mission specifically implies that individual economic circumstances are the result of individual choices. One of the major units within the TWC is the Civil Rights Division, which notes its purpose as being to "provide an avenue to file a complaint for individuals who believe they have been discriminated against in an employment or housing transaction." Unlike, HUD, DoJ, or the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Civil Rights Division makes no statement or concession that unlawful forms of discrimination are a part of social life and the need to eliminate it entirely. Again, we see harm management in action through the institutionalized contradiction between this administrative unit's mission statement language that emphasizes technical and bureaucratic processes ("file a

complaint" and "jurisdictional requirements") and the TWC's goal of offering Texans the opportunity to achieve economic prosperity.

In the aforementioned cases of TDHCA and the TWC, along with all other Texas administrative units listed in Table 2.2, we observe a sharp change in mission language between departments of the federal government and those of the state of Texas. As mentioned previously, the mission statements of the highest-level federal executive agencies make consistent use of promissory or obligatory rhetoric. The state of Texas, and its executive units make no use of equal or similar language. Even the TDSHS with its seemingly supportive, positive, and succinct mission statement (see Table 2.2) regarding healthcare and Texans' wellbeing minimizes the scope of the state's purpose. The use of "improve" signifies the state's aim is merely to eliminate some portion, no matter how small, of healthcare related social harm; it denotes incremental change with reforms that partially mitigate social harm, but in function knowingly allows social harm to continue. Thus, we see that institutionalized contradictions generate managerial effects in relation to social harm not only within bureaucratic administrative units, but occur between the federal government and the state of Texas as different aspects of the U.S. nation-state. It is highly unlikely this is unique to the federal government and Texas, but this particular set of institutionalized contradictions is especially important to this study given my participants' reliance on and location in Texas.

Sociological analysis of the state can be particularly difficult for many reasons, however I would argue one of the exceedingly challenging reasons are Americans', including scholars, desire to hold to our socialized belief in the eventual efficacy of our pluralistic democratic government. I would add this desire is not only a function of being socialized into an altruistic view of the U.S., but is also an effect of the very human response to hope steadfastly that we are better than what we have been and currently are.

In part, it is the very human impulse to hope, that makes American exceptionalism such an enticing set of propositions for so many, even those on the margins, including TLGBQ Latin@s. However, if we reflexively set aside both of these impulses, we are able to observe that incredible contradictions occur within the institutionalized rhetoric and practices of state organizations. No reasonable expectation can exist that various, or any, social harms will be prevented or eliminated through current state strategies, and by extension they implicitly allow for tremendous amounts of harm and pain to continue in perpetuity. At the same time it must be acknowledged both that the state does intervene in some forms of social harm on a limited basis *and* that several historical precedents exist for the state's success in eliminating social harm. All this leads me to conclude that the U.S. state's role in social harm is in function, if not also in form, as harm manager. In effect, the state's function as harm manager leaves TLGBQ Latin@s incredibly vulnerable to all forms of social harm, because they occupy subjectivities that lie outside of formal sociopolitical importance, and in an environment where the state is focused on "consumers" and "clients" TLGBQ Latin@s simply do not exist.

Consumer-Driven Priorities

In 2004, the United States General Accounting Office (GAO) authored a report entitled *High-Performing Organizations: Metrics, Means, and Mechanisms for Achieving High Performance in the 21st Century Public Management Environment*, the report was authored in order to address the concern that "the federal government faces a range of new challenges in the 21st century that it must confront to enhance performance, ensure accountability, and position the nation for the future" (p. 1). The GAO convened participants from across governmental and economic sectors. One of the key areas of agreement was

> that high-performing organizations focus on the needs of their clients and customers. This entails at a minimum, undertaking concerted efforts to understand and respond to client and customer needs, measuring progress toward meeting these needs, and publicly reporting on that progress and improvement opportunities–to help assure appropriate accountability and transparency. (p. 9, GAO 2004)

The federal government is not the only sector of the U.S. nation-state utilizing language about and concerned with the needs of customers and clients. The first line of the mission of the State of Texas is "Texas state government must be limited, efficient, and completely accountable" (p. 2, Texas Education Agency 2012). To this end, Texas has established a statutory requirement that all state agencies submit biennial reports on customer service satisfaction. This rule applies to all of the departments and offices listed in Table 2 with one exception: the Department of Public Safety. This concern for customer service, and the importance of the "customer" and the "client," raises the question: who are the customers and clients that state agents are to be accountable?

The answer to this question depends on which state department or agency we are referring to, each department is able to define for themselves who constitutes their customer base. As a general rule, departments define their customers as those Texas residents who directly utilize or are most likely to utilize their services. As a practice, no department disaggregates their data by race, ethnicity, gender, age, or socioeconomic status, which are all the most common demographic characteristics reported with survey data. Each agency therefore represents their customers as a monolithic entity, with no statistically significant variations among different segments of survey respondents. Such a practice is extremely dubious in a state with substantial racial, ethnic, and economic diversity. This lack of demographic disaggregation prevents any useful analysis that would help establish whether agencies are performing similarly well across differences in race, ethnicity, gender, age, and socioeconomic status. Additionally, several agencies—

including the Texas Education Agency, the Department of Criminal Justice, the Texas Workforce Commission, and the Department for State Health Services—systematically exclude groups that should rationally be included in the pool of potential respondents. For example, the Texas Education Agency only surveyed people who are faculty and staff in public school districts; the experiences and opinions of students and their custodial guardians are not included and ignored. Even if lawmakers and policy analysts believed students were not capable of providing useful feedback, an assertion I argue is largely unfounded; there seems little rationale for not including, at the very least, their custodial guardians.

The most glaring example of a Texas agency excluding a whole class of people is the Texas Department of Criminal Justice. As can be seen in Table 2, the TDCJ is responsible for the administration of the state's penal and corrections systems. Despite the Department's reference of "offenders" throughout their mission statement, the TDCJ did not seek input from currently incarcerated individuals, those who are by definition the largest user of TDCJ "services." The Department defines their primary customer base, per the survey, as *only* 254 Texas county judges and two offender advocate groups (TDCJ 2014). TDCJ does provide an online version of the survey, which generated 166 responses from the general public in 2014 and would seem to indicate that very little promotion and recruitment is pursued. Given the specific history of unconstitutional inhumane carceral practices in Texas penal institutions (Martin & Ekland-Olson 1987, March & Marquart 1989), it is disconcerting that TDCJ did not recruit respondents that would speak to the experiences of those people incarcerated. They could survey inmates themselves, formerly incarcerated people, public defenders, Legal Aid staff, family members of those incarcerated, and/or staff of non-profit organizations that aid in the transition process of recently released inmates. Such a narrow construction of who

constitutes "the customer" belies a disingenuous desire to receive constructive feedback and be held accountable.

The disproportionate incarceration of Latin@s in Texas prisons and jails (Coyle 2003) makes this lack of feedback particularly detrimental to incarcerated Latin@s and the people that care about them. Additionally, compared to both White and Black Americans, in Texas, incarcerated Latin@s are more likely to serve their time in state prisons (emphasis on punishment) versus state jails[30] (emphasis is more on rehabilitation); therefore a larger proportion of Latin@ inmates are serving their terms in longer-sentence institutions compared to other racialized groups (Ibid.). Thus, the exclusion of Texas inmates, or their representatives, from TDCJ customer service surveys disproportionately affects Latin@ communities.

Although there are no available statistics on TLGBQ inmates in Texas, or anywhere, we know queer people come into contact with the penal system. Two participants—Joey Sanchez and Paloma Delgado—shared in their life story narratives their extensive experiences with two Texas penal institutions. For both Joey, an Hispanic gay man, and Paloma, a Latina transwoman, the time they spent in county jail and state prison, respectively, was mired in and shaped by many forms of social harm. The resulting harm and pain encountered by Joey and Paloma, and undoubtedly other incarcerated TLGBQ Latin@s, remains invisible to the TDCJ and other responsible state and county authorities.

At federal and state levels, TLGBQ Latin@s are never identified as a customer, client, or constituent group to be concerned with or about. The one exception to this voluminous silence on TLGBQ Latin@ issues and concerns, are a few programs by the Centers for Disease Control that focus on men of color who have sex with men (MSM) in an attempt to reduce HIV and other STI[31] rates of infection. The systematic and structural

invisibility of TLGBQ Latin@s in the day-to-day activities of the state's harm management practices has a profound effect on Latin@ queer people's experience of social harm. The absence of concern for TLGBQ Latin@ lives is best illustrated in my interview with Donna Emerson, a heterosexual Hispanic woman who works for an NGSAO that specializes in working with children who are victims of violence or are witnesses to traumatic events. At the time of our meeting, Donna was 54 years old, had a master's in social work and had been with her employer for many years. Towards the end of our conversation, I asked Donna about the relationship between identity and the experience of violence; the following represents this line of questioning and her response

David: Do you think there's a relationship between a person's identity, or any of their identities, and their experience of violence?

Donna: Oh, yeah.

David: And what do you think that relationship is? Could you give me an example? It doesn't have to be like an actual, it could be hypothetical, you know what's the…(trails off)?

Donna: Well I think about it in the sense, and again probably coming more from the clinical side is, I think sometimes, an experience with something kind of shapes your identity. And I think sometimes, sometimes people get stuck thinking that, when for instance when sexual abuse happens or physical abuse happens, and sometimes somehow I did something that caused this to happen, and so there must be something wrong with me. And I think sometimes those experiences shape someone's identity, and really impacts them, and so those are the things that we don't want to have happen, and so I think it can most definitely.

David: Do you think that Latinas, and Latinos who are transgender, lesbian, gay, bisexual, or queer encounter unique challenges as it relates to violence?

Donna: I have not had; I don't, I don't know that I want to be hypothetical with that, David, I don't know really. I would imagine that would be the case, but I don't know for sure.

During this exchange, Donna admits to a belief or understanding that there is a connection between identity and the experience of violence or harm. However, when asked what this relationship is, Donna's response relies on an exclusively psychological conception of identity; that identity is the understanding or conception of the self, the meaning we assign to our unique individual human life. This is not surprising given her background in social work, especially in the area of counseling and children. The connection between violence and identity for Donna is a temporally linear one; the effects of violence are in its aftermath and consequences. Her explanation of how violence and identity are related is limited to the internalized process of assigning guilt or responsibility by a survivor of social harm. In the end, when I specifically ask about TLGBQ Latin@ challenges with violence, Donna refuses to contemplate or speculate what they may be. She does hint at her belief that there are particular challenges for TLGBQ Latin@s, but that is as far as she is willing to answer the question. When I do ask her specifically about TLGBQ Latin@s her tone changes from one that is conversational, even contemplative in nature, to one that is adamant with traces of underlying nervous energy.

I cannot account for the shift in Donna's tone; but her response has several implications for TLGBQ Latin@s. First, it reveals that likely never before had Donna been asked to consider the material, economic, social, political, psychological, and emotional conditions of Latin@ queer lives, especially as it pertains to the experience of social harm. Donna does not have the tools or epistemological frameworks to remain imaginatively or empathically open to queer Latin@ pain. This is a little surprising, given two recent[32] and highly publicized murders of young lesbian Chicanas in Texas, one of which occurred in the community Donna's organization serves. Secondly, her overreliance on a psychological conception of identity creates an epistemological blind

spot. Identity circulates in social environments, not just in the internal lives of individuals. Therefore, a purely or mainly psychological consideration of identity prevents consideration for how being both Latin@ and TLGBQ (among other identities) heightens the vulnerability of Latin@ queer people and increases the level of un-safety across various environments. This is critical to understand because as revealed in the first chapter, TLGBQ Latin@s often encounter multiple forms of social harm simultaneously across many social spaces and relationships. Donna and her colleagues at the NGSAO mainly focus on incidents of family-based violence, and usually only then the most extreme cases. Children, youth, and their families are referred to Donna and her organization because of a specific or series of specific events. The focus on healing from a specific encounter with social harm does not recognize the algorithm of pain any individual TLGBQ Latin@ is using, as a result any services offered to a TLGBQ Latin@ survivor of family violence are likely not adequate or able to support and protect them.

Possibly the most important observation from my interview with Donna is her general disposition as someone who is very professional and has a sincere desire to help those whom she serves. During the course of our conversation it was evident that Donna understood clearly what her role and that of her agency is in the overall child welfare system of Texas. She described the practices and procedures of her organization with clinical precision. In short, Donna Emerson is, from my observation, in general, a well meaning and skilled professional. Despite her experience, training, and seemingly good intentions, it is clear from her interview that TLGBQ Latin@s occupy a minimal presence, if any, in her occupation as a clinical counselor to youth in trauma. Latin@ queer people exist beyond the horizon of the universe of potential consumers or clients. Some may wonder whether it is too much to expect Donna, and others like her, to know about TLGBQ Latin@ youth and their encounters with social harm, maybe she has not

had the opportunity to work with any Latin@ queer youth. To that I would respond it is highly unlikely this is the case. Donna Emerson has worked in a metropolitan area where there is a significant Latin@ population; additionally Heather Donaldson, a colleague of Emerson's who works for the state in their child welfare system, confirmed in her interview that the state has intervened in homes where there is violence by an adult against a child who is TLGBQ. It should be noted that Donaldson did not specify the racial or ethnic identities of those families. Thus the probability of Emerson having been involved in a case or cases with a Latin@ queer child or youth is reasonably high.

As with Bonilla-Silva's (2006) conceptualization of a color-blind racist, I argue his conclusions regarding contemporary manifestations of white supremacist racial ideology and practice apply to homophobia and increasingly transphobia. Meaning, contemporary manifestations of homophobia, transphobia, and racism are different from traditional or historical expressions of those ideologies and practices in *form only*, not in function. This neoliberal discourse on identity and power recognizes that inequality exists (albeit to a lesser degree than empirically proven), and the best course of action is to emphasize similarities over differences, preferably discard categories of identity that mark the boundaries of social hierarchies, and adhere to the general belief in an inevitable progressive modernity where social relations continually improve. These forms of racism, homophobia, and transphobia institutionalizes a hegemonic algorithm of pain within state activities managing social harm that renders TLGBQ Latin@ pain and lives to the extreme margins, at best, or, at worst, outside the realm of possible existence. It is this configuration of the state and social harm that lets TLGBQ Latin@s be harmed and does not require the state to always or even a majority of the time *do* the harm itself. It is this structuring of the state as a harm management organization that illustrates its efficiency. It does not require state agents to act consistently or unitarily as one in the harming of

TLGBQ Latin@s. This requirement does not exist because social harm is a partnership of sorts between public and private entities, that creates enough discursive space where the state engages directly in social harm frequently, intervenes in social harm on occasion, but mostly passively allows or condones indirect state social harm or the direct social harm of private individuals and entities. Such a configuration allows the state to maintain legitimacy through claims of neutrality and impartial administration of duties. In the rare occasion where a TLGBQ Latin@'s encounter with the state is popularly understood as social harm, the state is still able to assert a claim of innocence by depicting the event as isolated and the result of a "rogue agent" and not emblematic of a larger systemic practice. The diffusion of state responsibilities regarding social harm across a vast array of federal, state, and local administrative units maintains the invisibility of social harm ideologies and practices. In the end however, the consistent choice by state agencies to place TLGBQ Latin@ people outside of the field of consumer or client means their pain and harm is never truly identified and targeted for elimination and prevention, instead it is allowed, tolerated, and managed in practice, even if it is not consciously recognized.

CONCLUSION

The U.S. state has its own algorithm of pain that is codified in statutes, rules and regulations, government manuals and reports, court decisions and judicial precedence, and organizational norms. The state's algorithm of pain represents the synthesis of and affirms the experiences and perceptions of whiteness, cisgender masculinity, heterosexuality, U.S. nativity, and socioeconomic elite status. This affirmation results in tremendous political, economic, social, *and* emotional resources that are directed to and accrued in ever increasing quantities to those individuals who embody normalized subjectivities.

The state's algorithm of pain is operationalized in its function as a *harm management organization*, an entity predicated not on the elimination of social harm but in its maintenance and regulation. Although its role as a harm management organization seemingly runs afoul of the state's very own rhetoric, and that of the mainstream public, that the U.S. form of government is designed to address various forms of social harm, and does so with reasonable success, it is able to achieve this ostensible paradox given the myriad of institutionalized contradictions that occur throughout different levels of government and across a variety of agencies and departments. These institutionalized contradictions help maintain the veneer of legitimacy while allowing the state to both actively and passively condone social harm. As shown in this chapter, it is the consistency of the institutionalized contradictions across the various levels of government and policy area that belies the deeper sociological function and meaning of the state in relation to social harm. The state excludes TLGBQ Latin@s from its algorithm of pain and as a result manages their experiences of social harm via the state's construction and use of the "client" or "consumer" in delivering services, especially those services that prevent or ameliorate social harm events. In the vast bureaucracy of the federal and Texas governments, the exclusion of TLGBQ Latin@s by some fraction of individual state actors is likely a result of the social animus they hold towards Latin@ queer people. However, as illustrated by Donna Emerson, the omission of TLGBQ Latin@s as a legitimate and important "client" of state anti-social harm activities is more often the result of a epistemological blind spot instead of some explicit virulent form of homophobia, transphobia or white supremacy. Nonetheless, this blind spot is a passive articulation of oppressions that are established and nurtured throughout a person's formative developmental stages when critical socialization occurs and norms established. In practice, TLGBQ Latin@s just do not exist in the daily conversations, considerations,

programs, and policymaking by individual state actors, and in total the state. This absence of TLGBQ Latin@s from the category of "client" or "consumer" goes beyond traditional conceptualizations of invisible subjectivities or populations; rather, even within the limited anti-social harm regime of the U.S. state, the lives and experiences of TLGBQ Latin@s remains an ontological impossibility. As mentioned before, Latin@ queers do not exist even within the realm or horizon of possibility in the day-to-day activities of the state, TLGBQ Latin@ pain is relegated in practice then to the oblivion of unconsidered and impossible thought forms.

As examined at the beginning of the chapter, TLGBQ Latin@s share a similar if not common critique of the state. Where the difference appears to enter is in individuals' estimations of either the potential for social justice via the state or the practical need for the state to play some role in an overall project that achieves freedom and liberation from social harm for Latin@ TLGBQ people. It is this practical logic (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992), rooted in the material and emotional lives of TLGBQ Latin@s, which fosters a pragmatic politics of social justice. This pragmatism however should not be conflated with a belief in or support for incremental improvements or neoliberal reforms. TLGBQ Latin@s are not a monolithic group in their political analysis or activism, but for most of the Latin@ queers I spoke with, there is a recognition that the state is a necessary entity in the lives of people, a complex society of over 300 million individuals requires the need for government, the presence of a state apparatus. For Isidro and Sonia, a nihilistic critique of the state is ultimately not useful in achieving real, significant, and permanent changes for Latin@ TLGBQ people. Conversely, neither are they interested in merely moving the needle forward, they often seek dramatic social transformation, but believe the state has a role to fulfill in this transformation.

It is beyond the scope of this chapter to list the myriad of actions the state could dismantle the harm management structure that maintains and exacerbates social harm. However, let me take a moment to highlight two specific, and practical steps the state and its representatives could take that are critical in the long-term project of social transformation. First, there must be *formal recognition* by the state of its historical and present role in recreating and promulgating social harm in the lives of TLGBQ Latin@s and in the lives of other minoritized populations in the U.S., and even globally. This formal recognition cannot be merely symbolic in nature; it must incorporate measures that redistribute power relations at the macrosocial level, which is not about merely incorporating TLGBQ Latin@ state actors but more broadly ensuring state policies and practices do not exacerbate current social inequalities but also facilitate their elimination. This is a necessary dimension of formal recognition, because authentic and sincere recognition entails the acknowledgement that the state's historical and contemporary orientation has resulted in tremendous inequality in power relations and everyday social interactions. Therefore, formal recognition does not occur only in the realm of the discursive, but simultaneously takes place material terms as well. Secondly, and perhaps as a means to achieve the first step, the concept of the "client" or "consumer" in state activities must be abolished, because as long as there is a question of who is your client, there will always be individuals and groups who are placed in that category and others excluded. Additionally, the state should not replace language of the "client" and "consumer" with that of the "citizen" because it contains historically and contemporarily similar exclusionary politics. Instead of notions about client, consumer, or citizen, policymaking and governing should be conducted from a place of radical empathy (Cohen 2010). By this I mean law-making and policy formation and implementation should center the lives of those communities most vulnerable to current social harm

practices. The material and emotional realities that constitute the lived experiences of TLGBQ Latin@s should be a primary consideration for the state on how to change and move forward in a way that results in the complete elimination and prevention of social harm.

CHAPTER 3 - Racial Utterances: Racialized Pain, Queer Silences, and the Interpersonal Specter

How does one substantiate claims of racial injustice, inequality and discrimination without invoking talking about racism? This was the question I was left with one day during class discussion in a course called "Latino Civil Rights" that I was taking with Cecilia Muñoz[33]. At the time she who was a visiting fellow at the Ford School of Public Policy and Senior Vice President for the National Council of La Raza, the largest Latin@ Civil Rights (NCLR) organization in the U.S. Given the phenotypic diversity of the Latin@ population, I inquired how NCLR engaged its membership organizations around questions of Latin@s, race, and racism. Her response was succinct: "It's simple, we don't." I asked if she could explain, and she said that there was too much disagreement amongst membership organizations about whether a discourse of race and racism should be utilized, and how to deploy such talk. What are we to make of this? What is the significance of the nation's largest Latin@ civil rights organizations eschewing language related to systemic forms of racism? I was brought back to this exchange as I conducted the interviews with TLGBQ Latin@s. The four consistent broad categories of social harm TLGBQ Latin@s articulated in their life stories are racial, gendered, sexual, and class-based social harm. By far, narrative representations of racial social harm were the most complex to distill.

At first, I wondered why TLGBQ Latin@ participants were not talking about racism, or only doing so in seemingly cursory ways where race and racism would come into the conversation and just as quickly disappear. I considered that my physical appearance, as a Latino with white skin, might explain why my participants were making particular narrative choices in their testimonios. My perceived and actual social proximity

to whiteness and white privilege might be pushing them to self-censor race talk in our conversations. I made a conscious effort to utilize words and phrases like "racism," "racial discrimination," and "white supremacy" during the course of the interviews. Additionally, I was hyper-aware of my body language and facial features when participants talked about racial social harm in an effort to ensure that I was communicating empathy, sympathy, and affirmation. All of this was an effort to communicate my comfort with talking about white supremacy and racial discrimination. Even so, the explicit mentioning of racism and racial discrimination was much less consistent than I anticipated, especially given that many of the participants shared intimate details of their life, at times crying, sometimes pausing to hold back tears, and still others literally showing me the physical scars marking their body.

I considered the possibility that my sample of TLGBQ Latin@s were not experiencing the degree and types of racial social harm I expected. Eventually, I recognized that evidence of racial social harm was present, but it was not immediately legible to my analytical gaze.

In answering the question, what am I not looking for; I realized I was looking for what I considered full complete stories, thick with detail and explanation. I began searching for instances where there were comments in passing or barely there remarks indexing the presence of racialized social harm and pain, but not *announcing* it in ways I would expect from a racially minoritized subject. The use of silences, metaphors, comments in passing, is neither new nor infrequent. Nicole M. Guidotti-Hernández's (2011), in her study of 19th and early 20th century borderland violence, explains that narratives of violence against Mexicans, Mexican Americans, Chican@s, and indigenous people remain "almost unspeakable, that is people allude to the event, but rarely, if ever flesh out the details. I call these references utterances because they do something, they

posit something, and thus they imply action" (p. 2). Guidotti-Hernández explains that these utterances are conducted by both dominant mechanisms of white supremacist and hetero-patriarchal power in an effort to erase or silence histories of violence, but also practiced by those targeted by the violence in the first place. She argues that "if we read the utterance as the unspeakable, then we are presented with fragments of the very things selective memory bans from individual and national consciousness, the historical traces that are clearly there but not allowed to be heard, seen, or experienced" (Ibid, p. 5). A primary example of Guidotti-Hernández's utterances is Mexican *corridos*, a type of narrative song or ballad, whose frequent subject matter dealt with violence and social inequality.

Additionally, my conceptualization of racial utterances draws upon notions forwarded by James C. Scott (1990) in his idea of "hidden transcripts." Scott's concept explains that minoritized groups express different experiential narratives depending on whether they are in public or private. That private spaces afford the safety of the "backstage" where minoritized groups can easily communicate and critique their struggles with social inequality. Scott's observation that space matters in relation to the type of narrative(s) a marginalized individual or group will deploy; however, as we will see later in the chapter, TLGBQ Latin@ narratives of racial social harm are not as strongly linked to space as the theory of hidden transcripts would imply.

I build upon Guidotti-Hernández's notions of utterance and Scott's hidden transcripts through the concept of *racial utterances*. I identify racial utterance as an emotional or affective practice, a speech act filled with emotion and potential. An utterance represents a thought and declaration not yet mature, not yet willing or able to breath its full intention and weight into the present. An utterance is a mechanism through which a person's algorithm of pain registers the important presence of harm while not

requiring a full cognitive or conscious recognition of that pain. Like a panic attack that informs a person that they are under stress whether they realize or not, an utterance is a linguistic act that indexes a person's experience of pain whether they are fully aware of it or not.

Utterance, as a practice, conscious or otherwise, is not by definition limited to racialized social harm; instead, it is a narrative representation of various forms of social harm. What I uncovered in my study, however, is that racial utterances occur with greater regularity in the TLGBQ Latin@ life stories than any other kind of social harm utterance. I have come to understand utterances in general, and racial utterances in particular, as a type of queered silence[34]. It is queer because it counters the normative expectation that claims of racial social harm and pain can only be catalogued or communicated in particular ways. White supremacist practices engage in a never ending struggle to minimize or silence expressions and claims of racialized suffering, pain, and injustice. Frequently, only allowing the most egregious and explicit forms of racial social harm to be narrated and registered on a collective level. Like all narrative and other representational practices of pain and social harm, racial utterances are intimately connected to individual and collective algorithms of pain. In other words, racial utterances are a function of an algorithm of pain.

It is important to resist the impulse to reduce the use of racial utterances to a motivation of fear; that individual TLGBQ Latin@s feel unsafe or fearful of articulating more expansive narratives of racial social harm and pain. Undoubtedly, fear could be a dominant appraisal within an algorithm of pain and as a result deploy racial utterances. In reality, it is not always possible to identify all of the factors shaping TLGBQ Latin@ algorithms of pain that produce racial utterances. What is most important is to not rely on prevailing assumptions of what silence or utterances ultimately mean. In the end, it may

be impossible to ascertain the meaning of every racial utterance made by the TLGBQ Latin@ participants in this study. However, that does not mean it is impossible to determine the meaning, especially when using a life story approach.

As explored in Chapter 1, algorithms of pain incorporate and utilize experiences from throughout the life that produce an emotional response that encodes information about the immediate event and circumstances TLGBQ Latin@ participants are in while also shaping and changing information and meaning about past experiences and potential future ones. All this is to say, that although racial utterances in the context of a life story interview may not provide much detail or thick description about a particular event or series of social harm, it is still located within the larger life story narrative TLGBQ Latin@ participants are creating. The totality of the life story provides context clues to the hidden meanings of participants' racial utterances.

To be clear, racial utterances were not incorporated into all participants' life stories. By comparing the life stories between those who utilized racial utterances and those who did not facilitates the identification of social factors that shape algorithms of pain and ultimately TLGBQ Latin@ experiences of social harm. I focus on racial utterances because they pose the greatest challenge for collective understanding. In Chapter 1, I provide a general primer for understanding TLGBQ Latin@ pain through the analytic lens of algorithms of pain; in this chapter, I zoom-in to a very specific expression of the algorithms of pain to identify aspects of TLGBQ Latin@ narratives that do not conform to dominant expectations of what pain and its narrative representation should look like.

To this end, what follows is an exploration of two observable patterns when comparing TLGBQ Latin@s who utilized racial utterances and those who did not. The first pattern involves the greater likelihood that racial utterances will *not* be utilized when

TLGBQ Latin@s have been exposed to explicitly communicated racial ideologies during the formative years of their youth. The second pattern involves the reality that the U.S. labor market is racially stratified, and as a result Latin@s are often segmented into racially homogenous or "minority majority" workplaces (DeFreita 1988, McLafferty & Preston 1992, Segura 1984). TLGBQ Latin@ professionals—those who have been able to navigate racial, gender, and sexual barriers in the labor market and educational institutions—contend with overwhelming white workplace environments that make them susceptible to specific forms of racial social harm and as a result are less likely to use racial utterances. Lastly, I place these patterns and the practice of racial utterances within the larger social context of Latinidad as ethnoracial social formations of the nation-state.

RACE(-ISM) IN FOCUS: RACIAL IDEOLOGIES & TLGBQ LATIN@ SOCIALIZATION

Amongst the twenty-six life-story interviews conducted are two participants, Susana Blake and Rodrigo Salas, who best represent the role of racial ideology and the construction of TLGBQ Latin@ algorithms of pain. Susana and Rodrigo are unique in that they are a part of each other's social circle and have spent a significant amount of time in the same social spaces. Methodologically, this provides an opportunity to compare the portions of their life stories that take place in the same social spaces. Beyond being a part of the same social network, Susana and Rodrigo share a number of similarities. Both were eighteen years old when I interviewed them. Susana saw a post on Tumblr advertising the project and contacted me; she forwarded this announcement to Rodrigo who then said he was interested in talking. They both attended the same high school in a North Texas suburb where they spent their adolescent formative years, and both were born and lived outside of Texas during the earliest years of their childhood. Rodrigo was born in South Florida but resided with his family in a major southern U.S.

metropolitan region during his youngest years. Susana was born and grew up in the capital of a Great Plains state. Both their families are poor, and receive various kinds of public assistance. Susana's family faces greater economic hardship because the family's resources are directed toward the medical needs of her youngest sister who is terminally ill. Both individuals identify as Hispanic; Susana views this as a racial category and Rodrigo understands it more as an ethnic label.

Susana and I spoke via Skype; she describes herself as a "fair skin," "Hispanic," cisgender, "lesbian" who was currently unemployed and financially supported by her twenty-four year old girlfriend. Ethnically, she describes herself as "mixed" because she is of Mexican, Vietnamese, and German descent. She explains that both of her parents are Hispanic, but that her father was adopted and raised by a white family. Susana stated she has aspirations to become a make-up artist and wants to go to cosmetology school. During our conversation, themes of race, class, and sexuality and their explicit rendering figured highly in Susana's life story. She reported feeling a significant degree of marginality and social exclusion in school because of her family's poverty and not being able to afford new clothes and other social status symbols like a cell phone. Fellow kids would taunt her and make snide remarks at her. Susana shared a story of her 6th grade year, where a school official yelled at her for wearing an "inappropriate" shirt that revealed too much skin. Susana explained to me that the shirt was ill fitting and showed her midriff because her family could not afford to buy her new clothes and so this garment, and many others at the time, were old and no longer fit her. After sharing with me how being the economic social harm of poverty structured her school experience, I inquired about her experience of racial social harm:

David: Would they [fellow students] ever say anything about you being Hispanic?

Susana: Yeah, some of them would. They would make comments about that because I was in the GT class.

David: What's that?

Susana: It's the gifted and talented class, so I was doing all of that and they would make comments about how they didn't think that Mexicans can be smart. They're like, "Well, I guess Mexicans can be good at some things. They do a good job making cheeseburgers at McDonald's." It was stuff like that all the time, just terrible things. And then even the teacher, if I wasn't understanding a concept or something or if I was just doing something, she would start talking to me in Spanish really slow, but not even real Spanish, like television Spanish. She would start talking to me really slow and be like, "¿Entiendes lo que estoy diciendo?" [Do you understand what I am saying to you?] It was just terrible. I just felt like crap. She would just be like, "Do you need to go back to Mexico?" and things like that. That just made me feel like crap and I was like, "You shouldn't be saying stuff like that to kids."

David: What subject did this teacher teach?

Susana: English.

David: Were there any other teachers that were maybe not as bad, maybe worse?

Susana: Yeah. There were some. I remember there was a math teacher and I'm not very great at math. But I wasn't in the GT for math. I was in there for English. But the English teacher, I was just asking her questions about the book we were reading. It wasn't content based. It was like what chapter we were on or whatever. But then the math teacher, I wasn't very good at math, and I remember that he would give me a lot of shit for that and he would just be like, "Do I need to take you to the ESL class?" I was born in the United States. I was like I can speak English. He would say questions on the board and I would raise my hand to answer it and then he'd be like, "Sorry, English speakers only." But it's like I can speak Spanish. I don't understand. I didn't understand that, but I guess it's because I had friends that spoke Spanish and didn't speak English that well, so maybe he was just like, "Oh, that group of people." But I don't know. Most of my friends growing up were Hispanic and stuff, but I guess most of my friends were Hispanic up until the GSA and then I started branching out more. I just thought it was terrible the way that we were being treated.

Susana does not equivocate about the impact racial social harm has had on her school experience. She provides a litany of stereotypes of people of Mexican-descent, and by extension all Latin@s, as perpetual foreigners and incapable of intelligence and academic success. Her narrative reveals feelings of hurt, anger, and frustration, culminating in a couple of moments where she exasperatingly says these events made her "feel like crap." Some might say that what her English teacher did was inappropriate but it could have been worse, and at the end of the day she was still in the gifted and talented class. Susana's attempt to give voice to her racialized pain is not connected solely to this single event, but how this moment, this story comes to represent the universe of racial social harm she must contend with in school. Her narrative of the racist social harm she encounters in the gifted and talented program pushes back on the commonly held belief that such academic spaces are filled with "good students" and "good teachers," where all are safe and the "brightest" students are nurtured and educated.

Later in the interview, Susana shares the social dynamics of her transition into publicly expressing a lesbian identity in school:

David: Okay. Then you said sophomore year, that's when you started getting involved in the GSA. I'm guessing that was predominantly white or all white.

Susana: Yeah, yeah. There might have been one other person and she was Asian.

David: Okay. And you said that at that point, you started hanging out with the GSA folks more than your previous ones.

Susana: Yeah.

David: Did you feel like you had to make that choice between the two or how did that happen that you switched friends or left friends? Maybe you didn't do that. I don't know. I just want to understand that a little more.

Susana: I guess I don't know. I felt kind of strange because I felt like I couldn't come out. For a long time, I was sneaking to GSA after school because I

felt like I didn't want to come out to my friends that were Hispanic because I didn't know how they would feel. It wasn't something that we even really talked about that much other than like oh, that person looks so gay or something like that. I started hanging out with them more and I would try to talk to my other friends, but it felt like I was hiding a part of myself even more since I was getting involved with people that were LGBT. I had some friends still that were – I guess like junior year, I just starting -- I didn't care anymore and I just put it on my Facebook that I was a lesbian. And as far as my friends went, I didn't care anymore. So I was just like whatever, they can know. They there were a few of my friends that they just didn't care. Some others felt uncomfortable around me because I guess being Hispanic, you have this idea in your head of what it means to be gay and it just seems so outlandish. I don't know. Someone told me, "You're gay? That's so white." I was like okay. I didn't understand that.

David: Did you ask them what they meant?

Susana: I was like what, but they were just like, "Well, I mean white people are always being gay," and stuff like that. So I guess it's because on television, you don't really see anyone who's not white being gay, so I guess you wouldn't know. On telenovelas [Spanish language soap operas], I don't see any gay people on them. They were just like that's so white. I was just like okay. For a long time – I had a hard time with them anyways because a lot of them, their skin was a lot darker than mine, so they would make jokes about that. But when I started hanging out with more white people, being so white, by being lesbian, then they were just lot – a lot of them were just like you're not one of us anymore. You're being more white.

For Susana it is important to seek social spaces where she could connect with other TLGBQ youth; however, her immersion in the racially homogenous GSA resulted in a painful shift in the racial composition of her social network. Susana reveals the prevailing belief amongst her heterosexual Latin@ classmates that gayness is a white identity and practice. Even though this association is painful for Susana, she expresses a degree of sympathy and understanding with them, because she assigns responsibility for this belief to racist media portrayals of TLGBQ characters in mainstream white televisual productions and to heterosexist representations of Latin@ characters within Spanish

language television shows. Such connections and emotional encoding in her narrative represent a dynamic algorithm of pain that is simultaneously connecting micro- and macro-level racial and heterosexist social harms and deriving particular observations and knowledge about the social world around her.

The compounding effects of multiple social harms are also evident in the above excerpt. Racist and heterosexist media portrayals inform the homophobic reactions of Susana's Latin@ classmates that in turn leads to racialized pain when the authenticity of Susana's Hispanic identity is questioned because of her sexuality. Susana's challenges are not limited to the reactions of her Latin@ friends; she expresses a sense of not being understood by her white peers in the GSA. This was never clearer than when Susana talks about the moment her parents figure out she is a lesbian. She says her white TLGBQ friends were urging her for months to come out to her family, and this is her reaction to their "well meaning" advice:

> But the thing was, is that a lot of other people in our club, they were urging me to come out. They were like, "It's a good idea to come out and your parents will get over it. I came out and at first, my parents were in shock, but then they got over it." But I think that it's a lot different because for them, they're white and middle class or upper class or whatever. Their parents weren't really religious and stuff, so I feel like for them, it was not even the same situation. I always felt really upset when I was talking to them about it because they were like, "You have to come out. You're not going to be happy until you come out." And I agree that you're happier when you come out, but there are a lot of issues with being Hispanic and your parents being Roman Catholic and going to church every day.

The peer pressure applied by white TLGBQ students to come out creates a sense of anxiety for Susana. The white members of the GSA cannot see Susana in her specific situation; rather they act from a place of their racial and economic standpoint that results in Susana's marginalization. Compared to other participants, Susana's life story is thick

with representations and critiques of racial, economic, and heterosexist social harm. At one point, I wondered to what degree Susana was exposed to critical racial ideologies

David: Okay. Did your parents ever talk about racism?

Susana: No.

David: Or discrimination?

Susana: No, not really.

David: It was sort of a silence around it.

Susana: Yeah, they didn't really talk to us about those things. I know my parents had a certain prejudice against African-Americans and stuff because they made a lot of jokes about that.

[…][35]

David: How do they feel about white people?

Susana: My mom says that you should never trust white people because they're always going to try to take something from you or they're always going to try to trick you into doing stuff. My dad, he was raised by white people, so he thinks that they're all right. My mom doesn't trust them. My mom, she will call someone to help fix something in the house. She'll call some plumber to fix something in the hours and then she'll see that he's white and then she'll be like, "Oh, I fixed it myself. You can go home." And then she'll try to find someone who's not – who is Hispanic. She tries to look for that. She would even rather go to one of those things where all the Hispanics and unemployed people stand and you just drive up and ask them if they could help you with stuff. She's rather go there instead of to a professional because doesn't trust people who aren't Hispanic.

David: Why do you think she doesn't trust white people?

Susana: I don't know. I really don't know because she married someone who was raised by white people. I think she could pass for white. I don't know. So I think that's _____, but that sometimes, she could pass for white if the person just wasn't that observant. I don't understand it. To me, I think it's kind of strange because I don't even see anything as to what they did to her.

David: Would you say your mom is not very open with you about stuff?

Susana: Yeah, I don't think she is very open. Well, she's open sometimes, but other times, she's just very closed. I know a lot of my family is here illegally and stuff and I know that she's very insecure about that. She's saying that if you tell white people, they're just going to tell the government because the government is all white people, I guess. She's thinks that white people trust the government too much. She doesn't trust them because she thinks that they'll just go to the government. And I can agree with that because sometimes, the white people that I've met, you talk to them about some problems that you have and immediately, they're like you need to call the police. That's not something that I'd want to do. Maybe eventually or something I can _____ where I live, but I just don't trust the police either. To me, I feel like they don't understand what it's like because to me, I would not feel comfortable calling the police.

Despite Susana's belief in the contrary, her mother expressed a fairly explicit racial ideology, which is not anti-racist, given the anti-Black prejudices and beliefs she holds, but rather it is an awareness of the racial inequalities Latin@s experience, and the social position of whites within that racial hierarchy. Significantly, Susana is not a passive recipient of her mother's racial ideology. She rejects her parents' explicit anti-Black racism, while simultaneously using her mother's criticism as a template for observing racial social harm perpetuated by individual white people and the dominant white racial hierarchy in her own life. Additionally, Susana does not avoid white people to the degree that her mother seems to do; this is exhibited by the fact that her current girlfriend is white and she still maintained membership in the white-dominated GSA despite her frustrations with the racial and economic normativity of the group. The case of Susana Blake reveals that a parent's own algorithm of pain informs the algorithm of pain of their children, but this process is not an exact transposition of one to the other.

When I meet Rodrigo Salas via Skype it is only months after he and Susana have graduated high school. He decides to wait several months before attending college,

instead opting to matriculate in the spring. He supports himself primarily through an hourly wage job at a fast food restaurant and the occasional photography gig. Rodrigo is very clear about what we would like to pursue as a career, "My occupation – my dream occupation is somewhere politically active among the LGBT community." He mentions being interested in working for the Human Rights Campaign. Rodrigo is a cisgender male who describes his sexuality as a "homosexual male." When I ask Rodrigo how he would describe his race, he offers up one of the more complex responses within the cohort of participants.

David: Okay. How would you identify your race?

Rodrigo: I would say it's – my ethnicity would be Hispanic and my race is somewhat complicated. I guess it's a mixture between White and Hispanic, I guess Latino.

David: Okay. Why would you say it's a mixture?

Rodrigo: It's a mixture because I also have Italian descendancy – ancestry from my dad and as far and as I know that's considered White. And I also have – yet they're both from a Latin American country.

David: Okay. Where are your parents from?

Rodrigo: They're from Venezuela.

His comments reveal the body of knowledge he has received regarding the racializing practices of the United States. Part of his family's ancestry is traced to Italy, which he understands to be "considered White;" but Rodrigo qualifies his remarks by saying "as far as I know." However, in his perspective, Venezuela and other Latin American countries are not white countries; it is a declaration founded in a sense of certainty. I ask Rodrigo how he would describe the color of his skin, his answer is likewise declarative and certain, "My color is white." I ask Rodrigo about discourses of race within his immediate family:

David: So the primary language you speak at home is Spanish, okay. Do you remember – did your parents ever talk about race in the home, or ethnicity?

Rodrigo: Not so much, but the things I do remember is it mostly it had to do with these like one thing that my parents don't like about American culture is that a birthday is at a paid place for two hours, you try mingle outside. In comparison to us, it's mostly at the home and it's from 6:00 o'clock in the evening till 7:00 o'clock the next morning and you're just still find it's more open and you pretty much have – it's very enjoyment-centered, while White Americans it's not so much, it's more like traditional "Oh it's your birthday, I'll sing happy birthday," that kind of stuff. So that was pretty much the main things that I would hear them talk about here in the house.

David: So they never talked about discrimination or anything like that?

Rodrigo: Not really. I don't think that I'm aware of; I don't think that we as a whole have ever been discriminated, just for being Hispanic, except for the fact that it mostly involved me and my sisters within the school system both in [southern metropolis] and here in Texas where just because we were from a different – just because we were Hispanic, regardless of whether we're born here or not, they wanted to place us in ESL program.

And they tried doing that at my school when I went to school and the teacher noticed, but he was like this is pointless, I don't know why he's in here, he's like excelling at everything. In fact he's way more in a sense advanced, we have materials like English writing in comparison to other students both in the ESL program and in the average classroom I guess. And my sisters they try to do the same thing. I mean my sister's blond with blue eyes with light skin. You wouldn't guess that she's Hispanic.

David: Yeah, okay.

Rodrigo: And being placed in all these classes and then when they figured out, "Oh your child is Latino, we're going to put them in ESL just based on that fact." And that really involves my parents in that sense; they really do not like that. And they did also with my younger sister. So that was I guess the only I guess discrimination type thing, assumption, stereotype. But apart from that I don't know as far as I'm aware not really.

Rodrigo's parents, according to his recollection, rarely talked about race or racism. Children's birthday parties exemplify his most prominent example of his parents' articulation of white cultural practices. When prompted about conversations regarding discrimination, Rodrigo first responds that they have not discussed discrimination, and believes his family has not been discriminated against because of their Hispanic identity. Immediately, however, he transitions into a narrative of the multiple times both he and his sister have been tracked into English as Second Language (ESL) classes because they are Hispanic, even though English is their primary language. This is a pattern I observed throughout the life stories I received. I argue this narrative representation is indicative of the elements of an algorithm of pain that are connected to the subconscious and unconscious that are seeking to give voice to the pain endured because of social harm, whether rooted in white supremacy, patriarchy, or xenophobia.

The linguistic pivot Rodrigo provides is a form of *racial utterance*. This racialized pain only becomes evident at my prompting of discussions about race and discrimination. It lacks any of the classic or expected emotional markers one imagines a story about racial discrimination would entail. Whereas Susana Blake's life story narrative explicitly marks racism, Rodrigo's narrative foregoes this convention. Rodrigo's use of racial utterances is not limited to this one instance; his characterization of the high school's GSA is another example:

David: Were you a part of any sort of like gay organizations in school?

Rodrigo: Yes, I was and it was my freshman year where a student named [Emily Snyder], she is bisexual and she started the club after pretty much two years of arguing with the administration to allow a LGBT group in school. I believe the name was [Pride Club]. It was very grassroots and things were great, it was a sit down where everybody would discuss things we were doing. But one of the things that led to its downfall as you can imagine the inter-dating. Well, dating people and

then they didn't like each other because they were dating, so pretty much everyone in that group dated each other. I wanted to join it, but not for dating purposes, solely because I wanted to do things to improve the community here you know, but my mom being [Indiscernible] at the time, but I did go to some meetings, but it just happened that those were the meetings that no one went to.

David: Okay.

Rodrigo: And then my friend, [Susana Blake], she took over the club and tried to make it more politically active in a sense and it didn't work well, because those that already went to it before. And we changed the name and everything, because people that went to the club before had a negative attitude towards it because of, "Oh yeah, _____," and the new people that came in were mostly I mean like drug dealers –sorry not drug dealers, but like druggies and stuff like that. She was like "I don't know what to deal with you guys; I want serious people who can seriously do something for the club." And I was a founder of a Society of Liberal students, that's through an organization at my school that I started and –.

David: What was it called again?

Rodrigo: Society of Liberal Students.

David: Okay.

Rodrigo: And one of the agendas was gay stuff […]

We know from Susana's life story that the GSA was overwhelmingly white, a detail that Rodrigo does not mention. What his life story does account for is a struggle within the GSA's general membership, and Rodrigo and Susana's desires for a more politically engaged organization. Rodrigo identifies this difference as being between he and Susana versus the "druggies," and from Susana's life story we discern the "druggies" he speaks of are white. At no point did Susana mention the drug activities of GSA members; nor did she ever talk about a conflict arising between her and the membership. Instead, she expressed resentment at the imposition of their cultural norms and expectations. It is possible that Susana would not disagree with Rodrigo's representation

of the GSA, but given the length of time Susana talked about the GSA she never made a similar characterization as Rodrigo. However, what is noteworthy is that both—the only Latin@ members of the GSA—mark the tensions that existed in the group. In spite of the divergences, Rodrigo and Susana's stories flag racial social harm in explicit and covert ways.

What accounts for the presence of racial utterances in one TLGBQ Latin@ life story, and not another person's story? This is a difficult question but one credible explanatory factor might be parental or family racial ideologies, and the ways children are socialized into them. Susana's algorithm of pain was shaped by her mother's racial discourse; and likewise, Rodrigo was influenced by his parents' racial ideology. Children do necessarily duplicate their parents' racial ideologies ; however, these ideologies represent some raw materials from which Susana and Rodrigo developed their algorithms of pain.

While Guidotti-Hernández (2011) characterizes racial utterances as rendering racial social harm invisible, I argue instead that when racial utterance is utilized by TLGBQ Latin@s, and likely other socially marginalized groups, it represents a stubborn, persistent desire for marking racialized pain.

THE PAIN OF SUCCESS: TLGBQ LATIN@ PROFESSIONALS & RACIALIZED SOCIAL HARM

Within TLGBQ Latin@ life stories, racial ideologies of parents and family were one major factor shaping queer Latin@ algorithms of pain. Another space was job markets. Latin@ professionals[36] described explicit encounters with racial social harm; contrarily those in jobs categorized as "unskilled" or "low-skilled," and receiving an hourly wage, make greater use of racial utterances. The labor market is a primary site wherein exclusionary strategies of race-class operate; entire subfields exist dedicated to

interrogating labor market segmentation, segregation, and discrimination. This is especially true for those TLGBQ Latin@s, and other people of color, who are employed in "professional" settings that usually require "high-skilled" labor since the majority of workers are white.

Anzaldúa (1987) utilizes the metaphor of the borderland to represent the conflict that is rooted in social inequalities. When persons occupying different locations on racial hierarchies are in proximity to each other, the greater are the conflicts. In other words, the "professional" workplace is one of those borderlands that is dominated by white, cisgender, heterosexual, middle- and upper-class men, and when non-normative bodies and identities enter this space social harm is likely to erupt. Conversely, low wage workspaces tend to be dominated by the less privileged. In general, racial social harm for TLGBQ Latin@s who work in predominantly Latin@ labor environments manifests itself in institutional practices and organizational cultural norms.

Isidro Zapata is a good example of the specificity of racial social harms that TLGBQ Latin@ professionals encounter in the labor market. Isidro is fifty-three when we talk; I am introduced to Isidro's partner, Ben. They have been together for over twenty years, and while we talk, Ben is in a different part of the house. Isidro was born in the Texas Panhandle and relocated to Central Texas in his early twenties. Isidro's move was precipitated by his need to leave his hometown because of his relationship with a physically abusive male partner. He is cisgender and "brown," identifies as "gay," and labels both his race and ethnicity as "Latino" and is of Mexican-descent. Isidro has earned a bachelor's degree at a public university in Texas. Isidro's experience in the labor market is one of the topics he spent the most time narrating in his life story.

Isidro's first major job was in his hometown at a large telecommunications company that no longer exists. He summarizes his time there in the following way

David: When you were working at Southwestern Bell, was that -- how was that as a working environment?

Isidro: In Amarillo it was pretty positive. So even if I lived there everybody thought I was a straight guy and like there was nothing. And it was funny because there were a lot of other gay guys that worked there. But we all sort of put on this persona that we were straight. It was just not a place where you felt safe to come out. We even had a guy that was transgender that worked there.

David: Who was born a man?

Isidro: Born a man and identified as a woman.

David: So did this person come dressed as a woman to work or no?

Isidro: No he came dressed as a man.

[…][37]

David: Would you say that you were closeted -- did you have a fear for being fired potentially or negatively affected in your work environment?

Isidro: If they find out, I don't think so. I mean I was a really good worker and there were some other managers that I knew were gay. And it didn't seem like they were affected by it at all. So I think that so long as you did your job and didn't you know I thought they were both married.

David: Were you ever afraid of being mistreated because of your race or ethnicity at work, at this time?

Isidro: …I would say no.

On one hand, Isidro states that it was unsafe enough that it was not possible to be out at work, even though there were managers who were gay (in heterosexual marriages) who he would see at the gay club. Yet, he also states that he was never afraid of losing his job because he was a good worker and was indispensable. Later in our conversation, Isidro admits that his years at the telecomm job were not fulfilling.

Ultimately, the pain Isidro associates with this job relates to his sadness and irritation that he could not be himself in the fullest sense, not just in terms of sexual

identity. Isidro's algorithm of pain is affected by the fact that it was his ability to transfer within the company to a city that facilitated his move to Central Texas and out of an abusive relationship. He is careful to qualify his response about racial social harm in the workplace to specifically the telecommunications company. As I come to find out, it will not always remain this way:

Isidro: [This is 19]85. And so they started talking and this is mostly white folks that were in these meetings and they started talking about doing something, and when they started talking about doing something [about HIV/AIDS] like talking with people, pulling together resources. And I would want to help but they would give me like these really menial tasks like here why don't you hang up these posters? Or things like that while they were doing the really large things either they thought I was too stupid, didn't know enough, I just wasn't given anything important to do. Anyway so I graduated [from college], I really wanted to do something around HIV and based on my experience in working with those white folks I'm like well, let me go volunteer at some place like [Orgullo (Pride)] some place that I think I can do more. So [the telecommunications corporation] was slowly closing down as a company, they were laying people off and they actually had this pretty good deal where it's like if you want to leave, we will pay your salary for six months while you look for a job and we will pay for your insurance for six months. So I'm like if I'm going to leave, now is the time. So I left and I started looking for work and within this six months I'm like, well let me at least volunteer, I will feel like I would be doing something. So that's when I met with the folks from [Orgullo] and I'm really like, you know, I really want to volunteer but I just don't want to answer phones or something, I want to do something else. So they put me in charge of the newsletter again and they also put me in charge of writing grants, which I really liked. And so after working there for a couple of months, I found out I really liked it and they really liked my work and then they offered me a job there so I worked at [Orgullo] for two years with [their HIV/AIDS project] and I was their program coordinator for two years.

David: Okay. And what was working there like?

Isidro: That was when I really sort of had my education, my awakening in terms of how me being Latino has affected me not only in the gay world but in the world as the outside. It really opened up my eyes with a lot.

David: How did – what else had -- what opened it up like what, how did that happen?

Isidro: Just becoming more aware of what was going on. I mean I'm sure I had experienced discrimination, I'm sure I've experienced these types of feedback in the white world and I either blew them off or didn't want to acknowledge it or set it aside but now in talking with different people on what they have dealt with, what they were going through and me certainly saying oh yeah that's right I have been through the same thing. It kind of led to that awakening and so I became much more aware and sensitive about how me being like you know affected group around me.

David: What were your experiences like at this time in your role? I guess within [Orgullo] and [Orgullo] at the time like was like a gay Latino organization that was its identity, what was its relationship with other Latino organizations or gay organizations. What was that like?

Isidro: Well with other -- in my interaction of course with other AIDS organizations so like with [HIV/AIDS, Inc.] and [the Community Clinic] and places like that, it wasn't always nice because they were the agencies that were getting most of the money and doing the least amount of work in [the neighborhoods with the most people of color] and so we and especially me – would constantly remind them of that its like hey you guys you are not around where we need you and you need to hire more people of color and you need to put more resources [in these neighborhoods] because there is so much need there and there is so much going on with HIV prevention that needs to go on but you are not meeting these needs and yet you are getting all the money. So it was really, really hard because again most -- so much of the racism I've encountered was in the gay community and that was sort of the biggest thing. It's their reluctance to realize or accept the fact that they could be racist. I mean they [white TLGBQ people] always thought well if I'm gay how can I be racist, I'm an oppressed group and if I'm an oppressed group there is no way I could oppress anyone else. So, I'm made to believe that people who are oppressed become the best oppressors a lot of times, I mean that's what they've been taught and so they did a bigger job of not acknowledging what needed to be there. It was hard, it was hard.

Isidro states in fairly unequivocal terms that he attributes his time and experiences with Orgullo to helping raise his consciousness and awareness about issues of racial injustice. Earlier in our conversation, Isidro had shared several examples of racial social

harm he and his siblings experienced in school, which they would talk about periodically amongst themselves; he even recalls his parents taking the whole family one time to a rally in a nearby town to protest an incident of police brutality towards a Latino man. It is not that Isidro was unaware of white supremacy, but it is his time at Orgullo that affords the opportunity to clarify and develop a more fully formed racial ideology and critique. For Isidro, at Orgullo for the first time in his life we was able to work in an all Latin@ TLGBQ work environment. Despite Isidro's fortune of finding a queer Latin@ employer, he was not shielded against racial social harm in the work environment. He worked for and coordinated the HIV/AIDS project of Orgullo, which required him to interact with mainstream (white) HIV/AIDS and TLGBQ organizations, along with the state's health apparatus. Isidro recalls the deep frustration, anger, and desperation in trying to get these organizations and agencies to expand their work in communities of color, who were, and still are, being disproportionately impacted by HIV/AIDS. The work at Orgullo required consistent interactions with white TLGBQ organizations and state agencies that exposed Isidro to specific forms of interpersonal racial social harm. His racialized pain is rooted in white TLGBQ people ignoring him and those he represented; white elites within and outside of the TLGBQ community were ignoring and denying the value of TLGBQ Latin@ life in the face of a very public epidemic. This dynamic created a particular organizational culture within Orgullo that forced the development of a very clear and conscious awareness and critique of white supremacy.

By the time of our interview Isidro worked for the state of Texas as a program manager for HIV/AIDS prevention. He genuinely enjoys working in public health, preventing the further spread of HIV while supporting those living with the virus; however, the day-to-day activities and the politics therein come with a cost:

> I feel very lucky and blessed to have this position to work. Not only with HIV prevention but in public heath that I'm doing right now because it's something I like, I really love doing and to be doing something that you really love and to be paid for it, to me it's amazing. Especially when I look back at jobs like [the telecomm job], I hated to go to work every single day. The only thing it did was pay the bills, this is something that I really look forward to and I love doing.
>
> So in that way it's been rewarding and the changes that we've made have been very small and incremental but but there is a lot of work we still need to do around addressing, and this has been going on since the early 90s addressing HIV in people of color communities. You know the statistics still bear that especially African Americans, and to some extent the Hispanics, disproportionally bear the brunt of that disease. And that to me, it's just shameful that it's been that way for 20 years. And some of the barriers I face is that, we uh have Latinos in positions of power now with the health department so I don't -- I just think there are issues around power that we need to address at the health department actually, if I think that we need to do something. And I say this because I was actually at a meeting with the powers that be about trying to do something about HIV in the African American community and they threw me out of there -- well they didn't throw me out they just never invited me back, and all I wanted them to do was do three simple things and I really need to admit it, the first to admit that we have done a pretty lousy job and that, the statistics kind of bear that out. But I think that's important because you can't be – you can't be – and you have to first admit, I need help or we are doing a really lousy before you can open your mind to other things but they weren't willing to do that. So that's the first thing I wanted them to do.

Isidro simultaneously experiences pride and shame in relation to his job and workplace, which reveals the inherent contradictions in even so-called safe spaces. He reveals that racialized pain is not always experienced exclusively via interpersonal mechanisms; the pain Isidro feels stems from the understanding that his agency is failing Black communities. Finally, Isidro's narrative provides a very clear example of how institutionalized racial social harm occurs. When he vocalizes his concerns about current HIV statistics to his superiors, he reports that their reaction was not to directly disagree with his assessment. Instead, he was never invited back to subsequent meetings. The frustration and anger he feels is the result of inaction; he understands that he is being thrown out.

Isidro's experience here also helps illustrate the state's harm management practices I spoke of in the previous chapter. The state of Texas has programs and projects with stated goals of HIV prevention, but it continues to pursue a course of action that fails. When this reality is brought into explicit view through Isidro's actions, the agency does not ameliorate the social harm that has been brought to its attention; instead it continues to operate as usual. The institutional algorithm of pain the state agency uses to determine programs and expenditures is not sensitive to Black life or death; therefore, no alarm bells are triggered at an institutional level.

Where Isidro renders explicit narratives of racial social harm in the labor market, Ezekiel Rodriguez utilizes racial utterances. Ezekiel is twenty-six when we meet at a coffee house. He self-identifies as a "brown" skin, "straight," "Chicano," who is "mainly male, with a different history"—his way of describing his particular type of trans* identity. He has one semester left in college, but is not sure what he would like to do in the future, although he says he is contemplating graduate school. Ezekiel has attended two different higher education institutions. The first is an elite liberal arts college in the Northeast U.S. where he faced incredible levels of racial, economic, and gendered social harm. As a result, he decided to transfer to a Texas public university that is also a Latino Serving Institution (LSI)[38] where his overall experiences are better than the liberal arts college. I ask him about his racial/ ethnic identity:

David: And then, do you think you were aware of your racial or ethnic identity at this time of your life, when you were that young [early childhood, 0-11]?

Ezekiel: I don't think so.

[Laughter]

David: No.

Ezekiel: Just 'cause we had been – I mean, it was – that school is mainly just, like, Mexican-American, working class families and, like, my only life at that time consisted of, like, my parents, my grandparents and then, people at that school. So, I just knew other people of, like, my own racial makeup.

David: Yeah. When do you think you became first aware of that you had or needed to have, you know, a racial identity?

Ezekiel: Probably in high school.

David: In high school?

Ezekiel: Yeah.

David: Okay. Why do you – why high school?

Ezekiel: Oh, I went – I ended up going to a private high school as well.

David: Was that – were they religiously affiliated?

Ezekiel: Yeah, it's also a Catholic school.

David: Okay.

Ezekiel: But, and it was an all girls one too.

[Laughter]

David: Okay.

Ezekiel: But, I mean, it's probably one of, like, the best private schools in [Central Texas] and, because of that, and there's like a lot of economic privilege that comes along with that, so, obviously, like, a lot of people that were only able to afford it were white.

David: Yeah.

Ezekiel: And so, it was really, kind of, a harsh awakening going from a middle school and an elementary school where it was, like, people of my own racial background to a place where it was, like, 80 percent white.

[Laughter]

David: Okay. So, would you say this was your first experience in being, like, a – like predominately white space?

Ezekiel: Yeah.

The homogeneity of Ezekiel's social world as a child shielded him from particular forms of racial social harm that he did not encounter until he entered high school. Ezekiel's impression of his high school is as a "harsh" space; not only is this a painful space for him but it is the space where he experienced racial pain for the first time. His use of "awakening" establishes this form of pain as a permanent fixture of his life, the racial pain he experiences is not bounded by time in a single event or finite series of events. Lastly, in talking about school Ezekiel is not tepid about naming whiteness or racism and white supremacy, importantly though, it was not limited to only school:

David: Okay. And did you ever tell your parents about, like, let's say, the cop stopping you to question you?

Ezekiel: No.

David: No. How come?

Ezekiel: I didn't tell my mom just 'cause she's one of those people that's like, "You shouldn't be wandering the streets in the first place."

[Laughter]

David: Yeah.

Ezekiel: So, I knew that that was just gonna get me in more trouble.

David: Yeah.

Ezekiel: And I just never got around to telling my dad or talking about it.

David: Okay. And then, would you ever tell them, like, what some of your classmates would say about Mexicans?

Ezekiel: Yeah. And I think my mom would, kind of, just, like, roll her eyes and, like, make a comment about white people. But, that was, like, it, but it never went further to, like, discussing.

David: *[Crosstalk].*

Ezekiel: She was just, like, "Oh, well, like, well, they don't know anything" or, like, or just make a comment, like, I don't know. Like, I don't even remember, but I just know that it was never really discussed as if racism was something that still existed. It was just like, "Oh, differences." Like, that's it.

David: Okay. Did you ever get frustrated at that time when you were that young about their, sort of, attitude about race?

Ezekiel: Not really 'cause I really didn't even start noticing things or coming to consciousness about race until, like, I graduated from high school.

Ezekiel narrates his earliest experiences of talking about race and racism with his parents, his mother in particular, where he must traverse a complex racially marked social terrain even within his own immediate family. He remains silent and does not tell his parents about certain kinds of racialized pain, including an incident where he is profiled by a white police officer and stopped in his own neighborhood one day after school. He makes this choice out of a fear of being blamed, unsupported, and or hassled by his mother. It is entirely possible that Ezekiel's mother's response could be based on her own attempt at managing the pain of being a Latina mother, knowing that her children are likely not safe.

This is the crux of the situation when discussing social harm: we try identifying who is to blame, and who is blameless. The problem with such an approach is that we render human lives, especially TLGBQ Latin@ lives, two-dimensionally because of our investment is seeking judgment and a determination of who is to blame. When we do this then we miss the totality of pain and social harm that affects social interactions, systemic practices, and cultural frameworks. Ultimately, I am asking whether our sociological imagination is flexible enough and our political solutions broad enough where we can

grasp and recognize the racialized pain of Ezekiel and his mom without minimizing his hurt or excusing her harm?

Ezekiel narrated racial social harms ranging from events in schools, with police, family, and a gentrifying neighborhood. Therefore, when he was silent about any racialized pain within the workplace, I was puzzled until I realized his silence was a racial utterance:

David: And then, so, at – where you currently work now, does anybody know that you're trans*?

Ezekiel: It's like a 50/50 toss-up, only 'cause I started working there, like, right in the middle of my transition. So, like, I actually work at [a high-end grocery story chain].

David: Okay. Okay.

Ezekiel: So, they have, like, a gender identity and sexuality non-discrimination policy, which is specifically why I applied there.

David: Okay.

Ezekiel: Like, I was, like, two months on testosterone and was looking for a job.

David: Okay.

Ezekiel: And it was just, like, "I'm just gonna apply here."

David: Yeah.

Ezekiel: And, like, in the interview, like, I straight up just told the manager, I was like, "I'm only applying here because you have this protected" and he was really cool about it. He was, like, "Okay, well, we understand."

[Laughter]

So, a lot of the people that I started out with know, just 'cause they were, kind of, still getting used to pronouns. And it was, kind of, a hassle, like, at first. No one said anything about it and, whether or not it's just 'cause they're just awesome and accepting or if it's because they were

scared of losing their job because we have that protected, like, I really don't care.

[Laughter]

'Cause, like, I'm like, I don't care.

David: Yeah. Yeah.

Ezekiel: Like, you have to keep that to yourself and that's awesome.

[Laughter]

But, we've had, like, new management and, kind of, like a high turnover rate in the past year, so we have a lot of new employees that have no idea.

David: Yeah.

Ezekiel: And so, I haven't come out to any of them and, as far as I know, I don't think any of my other coworkers have told anybody, just 'cause, like, I think that they're afraid that if they find out that they're talking about it, that they're gonna get in trouble, which, honestly, like, I probably could get them in trouble for talking about it.

David: Yeah.

Ezekiel: But, yeah, like, it's just, kind of like a non-issue now.

David: Okay.

Ezekiel makes no mention of race or racism in the workplace throughout his entire two-hour life story narrative. What makes this particularly puzzling is that in every other white space Ezekiel traverses he makes note of the racial social harm he encounters, this is the one exception. It is especially perplexing when we account for the kind of white space his workplace is. Ezekiel works as a cashier for a high-end grocery store chain that emphasizes natural foods and caters mainly to upper-middle class customers; the majority of the employees are white, as are the overwhelming majority of customers. Despite being a business whose clientele and business model are predicated upon serving

those within the upper echelons of social hierarchies, the dominant theme within Ezekiel's narrative is his experience as a trans* in the labor market. This is theme is established at the very beginning of our conversation when I ask him

David: […] So, the – okay. And then, the second statement was, "For the world to be a safe or safer place _____ needs to happen." And what was your response to that?

Ezekiel: I put just healthcare, jobs and resources. But, I guess, by resources, I meant more queer specific resources.

David: Okay.

Ezekiel: So, like, homeless shelters that are even allowing of queer people and/or transgendered people.

David: Yeah.

Ezekiel: Education surrounding that. Even just like, I think even from, like, an early age, like, instead of waiting until people are, like, 20, until they go to college to know that queer people exist.

[Laughter]

David: Yeah.

Ezekiel: So, stuff like that is really, sort of, big to me.

David: Okay. Okay. And why did you decide to, sort of, like, really – especially, like, healthcare and jobs, why did you, sort of – why do you think you, sort of, focused in on those two in particular?

Ezekiel: I think those were just my own responses based out of, like, where I'm coming from.

David: Okay.

Ezekiel: It's like a, as a trans person, it's really hard to find, like, comprehensive healthcare or even, when you do find comprehensive healthcare, it's really hard to be able to afford that, which is, like, where job comes in place.

David: Yeah. Yeah.

Ezekiel: But, at the same time, I mean, Texas, specifically, doesn't have any laws surrounding, like, protection for GLBT people in the workplace. So, even finding a job that is understanding of your sexual identity, your gender identity, is kind of a pain in the ass.

Ezekiel constructs trans* protections and provisions within the labor market and healthcare as a fundamental element the world would need in order to be deemed a safe place. His algorithm of pain situates these particular issues above all others to highlight their necessity to achieve safety. The economic vulnerability he must endure as a trans* person, especially as a trans* Latino weighs heavily on Ezekiel producing large quantities of anxiety and fear. It is such a paramount concern that he makes it clear that the only reason he works at his current employer is because they are one of the very few businesses in Texas that voluntarily include gender identity and expression in their non-discrimination policy. The racial social harm occurring in the grocery story remain invisible in Ezekiel's narrative because his gendered pain as a transman, given the nonexistent protections in Texas, override the desire for the narrative representation of any other pain he is experiencing in that space. The racial utterance is Ezekiel's silence, we only get some sense of other turmoil in the workplace when he mentions that there is new management and there has been high staff turnover in the last year, and emphasizes the fact that the *only* reason he is in this job is because of the non-discrimination policy that affords Ezekiel some sense of protection. All of this implies Ezekiel is quite discontent with many aspects of the job and workplace, but his algorithm of pain determines his willingness to tolerate, for the moment, other forms of pain because of the business' non-discrimination policy. Ezekiel is an important example of someone who uses racial utterance, but unlike Rodrigo Salas, he has a very clearly defined conscious framework that informs his understanding of the social world in terms of race and racism. Racial utterance is not a narrative representation that is only used by TLGBQ Latin@s

who lack exposure to an explicit discourses of race and racism within the family unit. Racial utterances are utilized for various reasons, among them, like Ezekiel, the need to communicate the relative importance of various forms of pain and social harm within a bounded social context (i.e. the workplace, school, family, etc.). The importance is to recognize the complexity of TLGBQ Latin@ algorithms of pain, which in the process of constructing a life story narrative must contend with and choose how to represent the multiple and simultaneous social harms and pain they have endured. Each choice—many of which do not occur on a conscious level—provides socially significant information. The critical step as sociologists is not to misrecognize the silences or overlook the possibility of racial utterances, I must place each story, each comment into the context and pattern of the overall life story a TLGBQ Latin@ participant is providing. Only in this way, I argue, can we accurately begin to quantify and understand the full rage of racial social harms TLGBQ Latin@ people suffer within the United States.

CONCLUSION

Listening to TLGBQ Latin@ narratives of social harm demands that we forego any assumptions of what we believe are essential elements or conventions of those narratives. The four case studies presented in this chapter—Susana Blake, Rodrigo Salas, Isidro Zapata, and Ezekiel Rodriguez—help illustrate the similarities within TLGBQ Latin@ experiences of racial social harm and the narrative representation of that racialized pain. These four life stories, however, provide a glimpse into the differences of how and why queer Latin@s experience racial social harm differently and come to narrate it as such.

In the course of analyzing the life stories of Latin@ TLGBQ people, I have come to identify racial utterances as a consistent trend within narrative constructions of racial

social harm. The difficulty however, has to do with identifying and understanding this type of data. Racial utterances are silences, oblique metaphors, and even outright contradictions that fly in the face of the desire for data forms that are easily observed, quantified, and/or transparent in their meaning. But social life is rarely transparent.

I would like to end this chapter with a discussion of the fact that in this chapter racial social harm was only represented by interpersonal interactions. The only example offered in the chapter where this was not the case, was the incident where Isidro Zapata was never invited to another meeting again by his superiors. I refer to this anxiety for representing racial social harm only via the interpersonal interaction as the *interpersonal specter*. The dominant discourse of racial social harm only recognizes interpersonal acts of racism. We see this in the discursive construction of the "rogue cop," the "isolated incident," the "racist co-worker/family member/friend," etc. None of these discursive constructions or narrative representations allow for the observation and critique of institutional practices and norms that appear on the surface racially neutral. TLGBQ Latin@s are socialized into this dominant discourse either willingly to some extent or through some feeling of pressure to have one's story or experience stand any chance of being understood and affirmed. The interpersonal specter is another factor that shapes the function and working of an algorithm of pain. As a result, it is hard to say just how much racial social harm remains unnarrated and unrecognized by Latin@ queer participants. The interpersonal specter however, does not claim complete authority in shaping an algorithm of pain. The unconscious and subconscious domains of the algorithm of pain lie outside the purview of the interpersonal specter, especially that of the unconscious. Thus, even in TLGBQ Latin@ individuals who closely align their experience of racial social harm within the dominant confines of the interpersonal specter, their algorithm of

pain may still be sensitive to and help narrate social harm experiences that lie outside this paradigm.

CHAPTER 4 - "They've taken the sweetest words": Family, TLGBQ Latin@s, and Social Harm

Family is a peculiar topic in discourses around social harm. We know the family is the site and context for tremendous amounts of social harm in various forms: sexual violence and abuse, intimate partner violence, child abuse and neglect, verbal harassment, emotional abuse, and elder abuse to name a few. Despite this empirical certainty, social life has been organized as if this was not a reality. The family as an institution and as an every day fact of life has been assigned great importance within mainstream society and Latin@ communities. Discussing social harm within families is a difficult prospect given the history of U.S. social sciences being used to pathologize black and brown families (Moynihan 1965, Lewis 1959, 1961, 1966).

Therefore, I begin this chapter with a caveat: family-based social harm is neither unique to nor a relatively greater problem in Latin@ families. This statement is true whether discussing family-based racial, anti-TLGBQ, or misogynistic social harm. The social location of Latin@ families generally, and the specific circumstances of individual Latin@ families may produce specific manifestations of social harm that may not be as common in other families; but this is true for white families and other families of color as well, that their specific social location within U.S. social hierarchies would produce specific forms of social harm. The comparative nature of this observation is obviously outside the empirical possibilities of this study, although it would be a rich line of inquiry for future research. With this being said, this chapter is organized and constructed to bring within analytic view forms of family-based social harm that lie outside sociological literature and popular discussion, especially regarding Latin@ families. These forms of

social harm are: family-based racial social harm and anti-queer social harm targeting TLGBQ Latin@ parents from their children.

¿COMO SALIÓ?: RACIAL SOCIAL HARM & LATIN@ FAMILIES

It has only been fairly recently that few scholars have called for an expansion in the understanding of race and racial inequality in the family context (Burton et al. 2010). An overwhelming majority of the scholarship concerning race and the family has focused on *racial socialization*, following the classic definition proffered by Marie Ferguson Peters (2002)

> The tasks Black parents share with all parents—providing for and raising children—are not only performed within the mundane extreme environmental stress of racism but include the responsibility of raising physically and emotionally healthy children who are Black in a society in which being Black has negative connotations. This is racial socialization. (p. 59)

Not surprisingly, this formulation of racial socialization focuses solely on Black parents and children, and other families of color theoretically, but leaves white families outside this intellectual focus. The lack of emphasis on white families is largely due to the definition this conceptualization focuses on is about preparing children to navigate a racist society and not looking at the role (white) families play in maintaining racial inequality. In reviewing research on families of color during the first decade of the 21st century, Burton et al. (2010) has observed "most importantly, there was also a lack of attention to colorism and how it shapes within-race/ethnic socialization practices of families, specifically immigrants from countries of origin with racialized and color-conscious hierarchies" (p. 453). In general, we know colorism has the potential to effect significant negative outcomes (Hochschild & Weaver 2007) and thus needs greater focus and attention.

During the pilot study in New York and the final iteration of this research in Texas, TLGBQ Latin@s with relative frequency narrated racial social harm within their family context, either in their immediate or extended family. If one is familiar with common historical and contemporary racial ideologies that traffic within Latin@ populations in the United States and Latin America, this phenomenon is surprising. In gender studies courses, it is a common technique to illustrate the importance of gender in society by pointing to the fact that the first thing most people, including parents, ask after a child is born is whether it is a boy or girl. Although this inquiry is also common within Latin@ families and communities, another question is often asked first or soon thereafter: ¿Como salió? (How do they look?).

This question betrays the common anxiety within Latin@ families of the racialized phenotypic traits a baby has inherited; ranging from skin color and hair texture, to eye color and nose and lip shape and size. Unlike, U.S. racial history and ideology, there was no one-drop doctrine within Latin American societies. Instead, many believe in the process and possibility of *blanqueamiento* (whitening) through carefully orchestrated and considered marriages, not only as a means to potentially raise your family's racial status, but also as a means to maintain a Latin@ families white or light-skin privilege and status. In the Spanish-speaking Caribbean, among many white-skin or "socially" white Latin@ families a fear of *requintamiento* exists—the idea that African (or any non-White) physical traits would appear generations after white or near white status was achieved (Cruz-Janzen 2010). Despite our knowledge of these prevailing racial doctrines no research has focused on the impact of this type of racial socialization within Latin@ families, especially families that have a diversity of racialized phenotypes. In the course of doing this research, it is clear that when given the opportunity to construct their own

life stories, TLGBQ Latin@s will narrate their experiences with racial social harm in the family.

I met Andres Gaitan on a Saturday morning at a small out of the way diner in the financial district of New York City. Andres was my fifth and final participant in the pilot study that has evolved into this project. At the time of our conversation, Andres is 24, college-educated, and recently unemployed. Andres identifies sexually as both queer and gay. Racially he identifies as mixed, because as he explained his father was Afro-Cuban and Moroccan, while his mother was Mexican. Although he understood his ethnic and racial familial heritage to be constructed as mixed, he made it very clear that he understood he was perceived by the world as a black man and very much embraced this part of his identity. Unfortunately, when Andres was a young child, both of his parents were killed in a car accident. As a result, his immigrant Mexican maternal grandparents were granted guardianship. During our conversation, Andres talks about being raised by two grandparents who have a difference racial identity than he does:

> **Andres:** I have one sister who her father is, umm, from the Dominican Republic, her name is [Angelica]. She is like probably my complexion-ish, a different shade but like my complexion. Umm, and she and I are the darkest people in the history of our family, like we just are you know, save for our fathers' families. Umm, and my grandmother growing up, I didn't live with her [Angelica], I lived with her [Angelica] maybe for a year on and off throughout my life. Like she would come in, which just, like live with her, meaning while I was with my grandparents she would come in and be like "this is crazy, I'm going back with my dad." Umm, so she would come in and out, but I would see her all the time. A few years ago we were having a conversation with several other siblings and I was talking about how my grandmother had really crazy notions of cleanliness, again going back to her childhood experiences. But umm, one of the ways I saw that was she would have me, and I thought everyone else was experiencing this, but she had me bathe, umm, twice a week in bathwater that had a lots of rubbing alcohol in it. And I thought it was just "boys are dirty" [laughs], and her, plus her Virgo, hypochondriac, OCD-cleaning tendencies. Umm, and then talking about

it with my siblings, umm, there were only two of us who had that experience, and my sister said that she thought it was because, she remembers it like my grandmother encouraging that like mostly when she was around, she was like 10 I think when my mom died. And so, when she went to, from the time she did live with my grandparents she was like going through puberty. And she was like and I associated it with menstruation, and maybe our grandmother just thought you know boys are dirty, girls are dirty some times. So we both had these ideas about of what that was about when in reality, in tandem with other things my grandmother says you know about color, about my people, we realized what was probably the truth in that situation.

David: So yeah, a lot of this was about lightening…

Andres: Yeah, although I know but you know rubbing alcohol is not the way to go. She has like a fifth grade Mexican education and that was like a point of pain and sensitivity for her, especially with her relationship with me. And I saw like, just talking about violence, like just I could see the remnants of the violence she experienced. Like the broken pieces of her self-confidence because of education and being an immigrant. Like my parents are, I was raised in an immigrant household. Seeing that was really interesting and then like experiencing that on like when a person is changed like that the way they act towards other people.

David: How would you describe the complexion of your grandparents?

Andres: My grandfather is really, really, really light, like really light, and not, he's a lot of European Spanish blood, whatever that means. Cuz the blood is different (laughs). And my grandmother, her mother was very fair-skinned, isn't that the worst term ever? But she was really white. Her dad was very like indigenous, like you know dark-skinned. And my grandmother looks very much like her father, like very indigenous looking, umm according to the Mexican standards of indigenousness. And yeah, so she, not saying that this is why she married my grandfather, but she married a man who was like sold to her as the ideal—

David: ¿mejorando la raza?

Andres: Yes. And umm, she probably wasn't too happy when her daughter, you know was like associating with men who did not fit her ideal, her aesthetic. And yeah, you see that play out a lot in your own family; I see a lot of that play out in my own family. Umm, having so many people having the diversity is a chance for people to learn how to be in

> community. It is the greatest tool we have: difference. And with that difference in my own family I have learned so much.

What is important to first note is that within Mexican and Latin American racial ideologies, multiple racial identities may reside within an ethnically homogenous family unit. Therefore, even though all members of the Gaitan family are of Mexican descent, Andres' grandfather is racially white, his grandmother is mestiza/indígena, and he himself is black/mulato. Additionally, Andres' grandparents could be understood as having an interracial marriage, even though under U.S. racial logic and subsequent public policy, this is not recognized. Repeatedly, Andres flags the language he uses to describe the racialized appearance of his grandparents and great-grandparents as absurd. The laughter and expressed absurdity is a form of blues humor[39] rooted in the racialized pain produced by a system that makes such arbitrary distinctions. Differences that mean something not only to the outside world, but to his abuelos as well, a meaning that is partly responsible for the tension and conflict that has characterized their relationship.

Andres' grandmother believed the rubbing alcohol to have bleaching or whitening properties that would help lighten her two grandchildren who she felt were far too dark. What is additionally worrisome during these episodes, beyond the clear anti-black and anti-indigenous racism the grandmother espoused, is that rubbing alcohol can cause serious sickness if inhaled or ingested. Therefore, the "lots of rubbing alcohol" Andres mentions could have been dangerous depending on the size and ventilation of the bathroom—given this was New York City, it was likely small—and whether he or his sister swallowed any of the alcohol-containing bath water, which would not be unusual for a child to do during a bath. Andres' statement also hints at a history of racially biased comments from his grandmother, which carry with them their own psychological and emotional pain and damage.

Andres is unique amongst participants because, as he explained to me, he has spent a considerable amount of time reflecting on the nature of violence and his own experience. This whole process has greatly shaped Andres' algorithm of pain and enabled him to find a measure of compassion for his abuela by observing and concluding much of the social harm she causes is rooted in the unresolved pain she has about her own experiences with social harm. Although Andres emphasizes the pain he believes his abuela feels in relationship to being an immigrant, lacking formal education, and the gendered social harm of her youth, I am left to wonder about her own experience of racial social harm. From Andres' description, I am lead to believe his grandmother is, at the very least, a very brown-skinned mestiza. Growing up in Mexico, especially at the time she did, being a poor darker-skinned mestiza placed her on the margins of Mexican society. Such an experience undoubtedly would have a tremendous impact on her own algorithm of pain, which for her resulted in an internalization of white supremacy instead of critiquing it.

Reflecting upon Andres' experience, especially in light of the harm management function of the state as discussed in Chapter 2, I wonder how could such racial social harm be prevented or intervened within the family context? There is a whole cadre of legal and commonplace categories designed to capture the various forms of violence, abuse, and other social harms that occur within families, both immediate and extended. These labels and terms range from domestic abuse, intimate partner violence, child and elder abuse and neglect, and sexual violence including incest, to less explicit forms such as sibling rivalry and jealousies, parental favoritism, and the disciplining of children. As the names of many of these categories of social harm imply, gender is an important organizing structure for social harm within family networks. As mentioned earlier, many feminist scholars have noted the family as a primary site for mechanisms of gendered

subordination (Hill Collins 1998), and even though many have not stated sexuality specifically, I would amend these observations to include it along with gender. Just as Burton et al. (2010) criticized the dearth of research on colorism within the family sociology and racial socialization literature, I would add that the family has remained a blind spot even for those scholars focusing on Latin@ experiences of colorism, who have focused mainly on employment and housing (Alba, Logan & Stults 2000, Arce et al. 1987, Espino & Franz 2002, Murguia & Telles 1996, Telles & Murguia 1990). Even in a study that looked at spousal status and skin tone for black and Mexican American women did not engage the full possibility and manifestations of colorism within the family (Hunter 2002).

It is my contention that historically and contemporarily the family for Latin@s has been a primary site for managing and policing the racialized Other; and not just managing and policing so-called undesirable racial subjectivities from without the family network, but more importantly from within it. The importance of the family in expelling or marginalizing people with darker skin or other non-Anglo features from its full membership or valued ranks can be summarized by a popular Latin American saying or dicho: mejorando la raza/improving the race, which I made reference to in my conversation with Andres. The saying refers to the racist ideology that advocates for the need to maintain a family's perceived white racial purity or eradicate non-Anglo phenotypic traits from a family's lineage by selecting a white or lighter-skinned individual for an appropriate heterosexual coupling. What is often overlooked in the analysis of this popular saying is the central role of the family unit in meting out racial privileges and social harm. What gets overlooked and remains invisible is the construction and existence of a racialized economy of emotions wherein the emotional, psychological, and even financial resources of the family are distributed differentially to

members depending on their approximation of the racial ideal and/or best positioned to 'improve the race.' There is one critical observation to be made however, and that is even though many Latin@ families, like the Gaitans, bring racial doctrines from their countries of origin, the racial social harm perpetrated through notions of *blanqueamiento* may serve a heightened purpose within a U.S. context. In Latin America, there are those individuals and families who are granted "socially" white status because of some other social, political, or economic capital (especially the latter two) they possess. No such process exists in the U.S. where white purity is essential under American racial doctrine. Thus, the racial social harm that places Latin@ families under great stress, could lead many to emphasize the need or desire to "marry good" to quickly improve the social status of the family as a form of survival.

We first met Ezekiel Rodriguez, a 26-year-old straight transgender Chicano, in Chapter 3 when discussing racial utterances and workplace environments. Ezekiel also shares with me several stories of how very light or white skin members of his family are differentially treated. It is important to note that Ezekiel describes his own color as "brown," in the middle of the racialized phenotypic continuum of his family. One recurring instance he shares with me was of two cousins; he explained

> on my dad's side I have two little second cousins, one who is eight and is really light skin, her dad is white. She has like strawberry blond hair, and then her little sister is like my skin tone and her grandmother, my aunt, umm completely favors uh [Sara], my light skin cousin. Like really, really like obvious. Like she will always tell her like oh you're so gorgeous, your so beautiful, like you have really great like blond curly hair. Like you could go into acting, you could be a movie star, you could be a model. And with the little one she doesn't tell her any of that.

What Ezekiel describes is a form of emotional abuse, racialized emotional abuse, which could and would not manifest without the presence of white racial ideologies and white structural racism organizing internal family dynamics. Sara, Ezekiel's very light

skinned cousin, is affirmed and granted emotional support in the form of compliments and adoration. Acting as if there is a limited supply of such emotional resources, Ezekiel's aunt denies similar support for her other younger, yet darker, granddaughter. Obviously, there is no limited supply, but rather a denial, a choice to refuse a family member the full benefit of affirmation and acceptance based upon how closely that member approximates the white racial ideal. Thus, we clearly are able to observe the logic and practice of a racialized economy of emotions within a family context.

There is one final important observation to be made about the appearance of racial social harm within Latin@ families; and that is racial social harm is often compounded by or compounds other forms of social harm, such as gendered or sexual social harm. In fact, we are able to observe how family-based racial social harm perpetuates and accentuates the gendered social harm of hegemonic beauty or aesthetic norms in the previous excerpt from Ezekiel. Young girls are almost always raised within a family context that urges and enforces the adoption of dominant beauty standards that place the thin White cisgender woman at its center. Ezekiel's cousin Sara, by virtue of her complexion and hair color and texture, holds the promise of attaining or maintaining this beauty standard. Sara's sister, by virtue of her skin color, is automatically disqualified from ever approximating this form of beauty, and therefore time should not be wasted on affirming her physical appearance. Let's be clear, that the dominant aesthetic norms demanded of Sara and her sister are harmful to both; however, their respective racialized appearances mediates this gendered social harm for both and provides racial privileges to one.

The experience of Sonia Roman, a cisgender Chicana who at times identifies as a "lesbian" and others as "pansexual," helps illustrate how other forms of social harm maintain or exacerbate family-based racial social harm. Sonia grew up in a physically

abusive home. One such instance was when Sonia was 14 years old and her father punched her "pretty hard" when she showed support for a news report playing on the car radio about equal rights for TLGBQ people. This instance left an indelible imprint on Sonia's life. When she came out as an adult she refused to say anything to her father; Dani, Sonia's younger sister, decided to tell their father about Sonia's sexuality hoping she could help because as Sonia explained

> [Dani], my sister who's always had a good relationship with him, has always been daddy's girl…I guess she talked to him, and he said 'what's going on? Why haven't I heard from [Sonia] in two years?' She told him, and to this day she will not say what he said, because she's like it's not worth ever repeating. And umm, she's never spoken to him again either. She cut all ties, 'I never want to talk, I don't want anything to do with you. You're a bad person.' And, that's her only parent she's ever gotten along with, and she cut him off for whatever he said about me.

The choice Dani made to sever all ties to her father was not made lightly. Dani, like her father, is much darker than her sister Sonia and their mother. Dani and Sonia's mother would often make comments about Dani's unmanageable kinky hair, and their mother's family would always make comments about Dani being too dark. Dani found more comfort and support with her father and his family, who are darker in complexion. Therefore, Dani's decision was not one merely to reject the heteropatriarchal violence of her father towards her sister, but to deny herself the only refuge she had within her family from racial social harm. This decision may seem rash and/or unnecessary by some, but interestingly Dani's algorithm of pain incorporates considerations of her sister's experience of pain and social harm. Dani is aware that Sonia, as the older sister, shielded her from much of their father's abusive behavior when they were young children. This protection facilitated in part a level of closeness that Dani likely would not have felt towards their father if Sonia had not performed this role, and as a result this knowledge

and understanding factors into the functioning of Dani's algorithm of pain in evaluating how to deal with their father once he is made aware of Sonia's sexuality. Beyond these observations concerning Dani's algorithm of pain, it is necessary to point out that ultimately it is their father's heteropatriarchal violence that maintains the racial social harm of his ex-wife and her family.

BIRTH PAINS: QUEER LATIN@ PARENTHOOD & HARMFUL CHILDREN

The contentious debates surrounding same-sex marriage, TLGBQ people adopting children, and queer content in school curriculum have placed TLGBQ families under great pressure. The need to establish the socio-political legitimacy of TLGBQ families has had significant effects on the questions being asked and researched, most of which focus on the quality of relationships in lesbian and gay male romantic couplings and the social and developmental outcomes for children of TLGBQ parents (Biblarz & Savci 2010). In addition to this emphasis in topic amongst researchers, was the added focus on mainly white lesbian and gay male families and romantic relationships (Moore 2008). One of the only sociological research on TLGBQ Latin@ families is Katie L. Acosta's (2013) study on sexually non-conforming Latinas and how they negotiate their families of origin as well as their families of choice, including their relationships with their romantic partners. A tremendous amount of work still remains to be done on TLGBQ Latin@ families; one of the topics needing serious attention is social harm.

That TLGBQ people, whether Latin@ or not, encounter social harm within the family is neither surprising nor new in the literature. Sociological and other social science research has been conducted for some time regarding TLGBQ (mostly LGBQ) youth coming out and the kinds of support and affirmation or non-support or hostility they receive (Gorman-Murray 2008, Heatherington & Lavner 2008, Hunter 2008, Morrow

2004, Wright & Perry 2006). The limitations of these studies are two-fold. First, as with research on TLGBQ parents, much of the research has focused on white TLGBQ youth; the result being modes of analysis that elide other dimensions of TLGBQ youth identities, such as race, ethnicity, class, ability, and immigration status. Thus they don't attend to the possibility of how other forms of social harm compound or complicate the anti-queer social harm they encounter and how they experience it as an evaluation of their algorithm of pain, as exhibited by Sonia and Dani. Secondly, similar to the normative construction of "hate crimes," anti-TLGBQ social harm in the family is always represented in fairly standardized terms: unaffirming and hostile parents and/or siblings taunt, physically abuse, or physically remove their queer child/sibling from the family residence. At times, there may even be mention of a lack of emotional support results in depression and suicidal ideation. The problem with this discursively produced normative lens on anti-queer family social harm is that it renders invisible so many configurations of family-based anti-TLGBQ social harm. Only the most obvious or common forms of this social harm are interrogated, allowing all other types available for unimpeded reproduction.

One of the most common elements within reported and investigated family-based anti-TLGBQ social harm is the representation of children as victims and parents as perpetrators. Rarely, if ever, is the opposite dynamic considered, not to mention analyzed and addressed. However, it is this exact phenomenon that I believe merits my attention, not just because it was present in the life stories of two TLGBQ Latin@ participants, but based upon the details of their narratives, it raises questions of whether the marginality of TLGBQ Latin@s makes them especially vulnerable to this form of social harm.

Octavio Quiñones is sixty years old when he volunteers to talk with me. He invites me over to his house on a Saturday morning and we sit at his circular dining room table where he tells me about his life story. He was born in central Texas, raised in

California by his maternal grandmother and step-grandfather, and returned to his hometown as soon as he turned eighteen years old where he remains to this day. He identifies as a "gay," "Hispanic," cisgender "male" with "brown" skin. He never attended college, but graduated from high school. He worked many decades as a municipal employee, has since retired, but currently is employed part-time as an HIV/AIDS educator by a local HIV/AIDS organization. Octavio is extremely proud of his work for both the city and the community organization. In reflecting on sources of anti-gay social harm in his life, Octavio explains

Octavio: Because of what I went [through] – they didn't understand it at the time they were too small for me to – it wasn't until a few years ago that I told them a little bit about it. I haven't told them everything about my story, they don't know that –. I mean I have some sons and you know I guess my life style and – and yeah I was thinking earlier you had said that a lot of – you're doing this [dissertation] and interview and you had asked me if I hadn't really been picked on or being gay or anything. It happened and I was thinking who sent me here. And I was going to – I remember telling you no. But you know what was funny that I get it in my own family with my own kids and that's in a way abuse, when my sons tells me "your going out with your fruity friends and you know that's not right, that's not – that's just not the lifestyle you should be living." And so that hurts me and to me I wasn't thinking outside the box not knowing that it's in here in my own home. Because I tell, it doesn't make a difference what my lifestyle is; I'm still your father. And I told him all I want is for you to say, you know what dad we don't agree with your lifestyle, but if you're happy we're happy and I said that's all I want to hear from you. So I have three boys living with me here now and one of them he gives me a hard time about my lifestyle, yeah so I think that hurts.

David: How old is he?

Octavio: He's, [Damon] is 23.

David: How – your oldest child is how old?

Octavio: My oldest child [Octavio] Jr., he's 36.

David: And your youngest?

Octavio: My youngest daughter is [Elsa] and she's 18.

David: Okay, so there's 18 year between all of them?

Octavio: Yes.

David: Okay.

Octavio: So, so I guess every day I have to put up with their comments.

David: Is it usually daily?

Octavio: Daily yes from my son yeah. The other two sons they don't really tell me nothing, they don't like it but they don't tell me nothing, just this one son.

David: Okay, do they ever say anything to him?

Octavio: No.

David: No, okay.

Octavio: They don't say nothing to each other.

At the beginning of this excerpt, Octavio makes mention of "what I went [through]." Octavio is referring to the years of sexual abuse he suffered at the hands of his maternal grandmother and her husband, his step-grandfather. This trauma was a foundational force in Octavio's algorithm of pain. Family is a complicated topic for Octavio because he holds on to the idea of and desire for family, despite it being family members who have been some of the greatest sources of pain and social harm in his life, including, unfortunately, his children, and in particular his son Damon. Octavio deeply desires Damon to accept him, and at the very least find happiness in the fact that he is happy. It is hard to recreate the palpable emotional pain Octavio expressed during our conversation, at times he cried and at other moments he held back tears through laborious sniffles. Even though it would seem Octavio's pain from the rejection of his child is very

near the surface and easily accessible, he admits that he did not think of this family at first when I initially asked about any anti-gay experiences. He concludes this oversight was his fault for not "thinking outside the box." This illustrates in some of the clearest terms the difficulty of consciously perceiving and narrating social harm in the family context. Even after this admission, we still see it operating when Octavio explains that his other sons feel the same as Damon, they just don't say anything; I am left wondering if Damon's brothers let him do the "dirty work" of anti-TLGBQ social harm while they remain surreptitiously in the background. Octavio has been married twice, both times with girls who were much younger than himself, we continued to talk about these marriages and the eleven children he fathered with them:

David: And then so the three sons that are living with you now are they all three from the same marriage?

Octavio: Yeah, well my first marriage she was 15 and I was 20 and we had four.

David: Okay.

Octavio: We had three sons and a daughter. And then the second marriage I got married my wife at that time was 14 and I was 29. I see is there a pattern here? That's what I'm trying to say and when into later on the years that I found out the pattern but with that marriage I had seven kids with her. So altogether I have seven boys and four girls and 25 grandkids and they all know grandpa is gay and they love grandpa, because they know that I hang out at the bars and they say oh grandpa, we love you grandpa. And say when are you going to find yourself a nice boyfriend grandpa? I said I don't know grandpa is getting old. But my grandkids and then my other son said you see what you're showing your grandkids and when I have my kids you're not going to be around them, because of your lifestyle, but then that's fine. I said but you see, I said just remember I said the way you treat me is the way your kids are going to treat you. And I said you never should be judgmental. I said you shouldn't be homophobic, I said because what goes around comes around, yes. And so we have a little saying that with my daughters, I always do this [makes a gesture with his hands that extends three fingers similar to Whoopi Goldberg's character,

Celie, in *The Color Purple*] and have you seen that movie 'The Color Purple' when she goes like this Whoopi Goldberg and I tell my son, I'll say okay son, this is it. When you get married your son's going to be gay and your daughter is going to be a lesbian and I said, if I wish, I hope I'm around to see him. He said no they're not because I'm going to raise him different; I said are you saying that I raised you different? I said you are not gay, as far as I know people are asking, out of your living kids any of them gay that I know of, no.

David: Yeah.

Octavio: So I – but I guess I do get it every day that that smart remarks that God made Adam and Eve not Adam and Steve, and how can you be dating guys that they are old enough to be your sons, if I am dating a guy right now he's 23 years old and my son is around that age, I have sons that age and you know. And I said you know what I'm just glad I'm living at 60 and I said I'm going to have a blast, I said I've come this far, I said God has brought me this far for a reason. And so I'm going to enjoy every moment I can – and so I guess I wanted – this is good for me, it's good therapy it got to kind of vent a little bit and then I think if you were to ask me, what's the moral of your story, well the moral of the story is that – I'm a 60 year old Hispanic male, got tied up in the sexual thing, with the culture and stuff like that and, and father of 11 kids. But then again I mean that's what makes the world go round, if everybody was the same, one of the things that I really took hard when I came out – I came out to both of my wives when I was 45. And I told them in a different times and I was very surprised at their response, both of them told me the same thing, but in different turns. They said oh we knew already, we were just waiting for you to tell it.

So that was a big and bigger surprise because I have a good support system with my ex-wives and their husbands and the thing is, how did they know, I asked them they said we just knew, just women instincts. She said, but you what it doesn't change anything, you still are the father of our kids. And so along this time I had this guilt that I brought these kids into this world, so I remember talking to a priest one time and he said well son, let me just put it this way, I said what – if God knew that I was going to be gay, why can't I just be gay from the beginning not to father these kids so they don't have to go through life being, being harassed or nothing. Then the priest answered to me on the phone he said look at it this way, those kids had to come into this world somehow and that's how they came, and ever since then I am

not saying I'm justifying it for it, but it put me at ease that that those 11 kids had to come into this world.

And I think that's where – I think that's where my compassion, my emotion – that I'm real emotional comes in, I think that's why I have been successful in working in the HIV field, because I can relate – relate to the client and here lately I was thinking of stepping back over the HIV field. And I – on May the 7th I – this year I diagnosed my 16 year old grandson with HIV and that was – that was one of the hardest things to have it in your own backyard and so it was really hard. And of course my daughter and her brothers and her mom, they all blamed me because of my lifestyle and because of the field that I work in I said well no, he had choices, I educated him on HIV. So we don't – I don't see him – I see him – they try – they keep him away from me and stuff because of…

David: Since then?

Octavio: Yeah, since then, but it just it goes to show that it can happen to anybody I mean and I had to go through something's and soul searching because I think, I'm 60 years old I started having sex when I was you know young. I think at least I've had over 1500 sex partners and to come this far and never been effected with any STD or anything – with HIV to this point, I consider myself very lucky. And then I have my own grandson, my grandson came out when he was 15 and he was gay, and at 16 he got infected. And so that gave me more of a determination to stay in the HIV field, a few more years, if I had been in the HIV field for 11 years I lost a partner from HIV and that's how I got into the field.

Octavio's life story is suffused with representations of compounding and cumulative social harm, both within and outside of the family context. In listening to and analyzing TLGBQ Latin@ life stories it is important to resist the impulse to characterize or read certain individuals represented in their narratives simply as villains, even if that is the representation participants intend. Octavio does not depict his son, Damon, as a villain, but he makes it very clear that he feels deeply hurt by him; going so far as comparing himself to the character of Celie in *The Color Purple* and his son to the character of Albert (aka Mister), Celie's very abusive husband. The reason for resisting

this simple characterization in most cases is simple: everyone is embedded within a social context where social harm is ever present, and even though we likely enact some form of social harm it does preclude a person's humanity. It is easy to resent Damon, and judge him, especially since we do not have glimpses into his own algorithm of pain; however, Octavio does provide some clue as to what is motivating in part Damon's harassment and the passive approval of some of his other children, especially his sons. In articulating, his feeling of guilt and shame for helping bring eleven children into the world and pursuing heterosexual marriages despite knowing he was gay, Octavio makes a comment that is easily overlooked, "why can't I just be gay from the beginning not to father these kids so they don't have to go through life being, being harassed or nothing." This single line in his narrative gives us some insight into his own algorithm of pain, but also the kind of social harm his children are exposed to in having a gay father. The actual and even potential harassment his children receive because of his sexuality is deeply troubling to Octavio, the depth of his pain however is a function his zealous commitment to keeping his children safe, which stems from his own childhood trauma. Even though he has adult children, it will always be his priority to protect them—as it is for many parents—which is driven largely because of his algorithm of pain.

The family-based anti-TLGBQ social harm structuring Octavio's testimonio stems not just from the disapproval of Damon and some of his children. As Octavio painfully describes, the recent revelation that his sixteen year-old gay grandson is HIV-positive has created a backlash within the family, where many in the family blame Octavio for his grandson contracting the virus. Octavio is not only blamed because he and his grandson share similar sexual identities, but because of his labor as an HIV educator. Additionally, a part of the pain Octavio feels with the diagnosis of his grandson, which he gave himself, is the realization that his grandson contracted the virus

even though he himself is HIV-negative despite having hundreds of sexual partners, and even a romantic partner who died of AIDS complications. The mention of his number of sexual liaisons and the death of a former lover invoke the presence of the HIV/AIDS epidemic and the incredible fear, grief, rage, and sadness that saturated the first 15 years of the epidemic. In this part of Octavio's narrative we observe the fusion of anti-TLGBQ social harm, HIV/AIDS stigma and discrimination, and ghosts of the HIV/AIDS epidemic that has touched Octavio's life. It is possible to take note of how feelings and events across time come together, aggregate, mutate, and disaggregate; it is the algorithm of pain in action responding to social harm.

Octavio was not the only TLGBQ Latin@ participant to express family-based anti-TLGBQ social harm as a queer parent. The oldest participant in the project shared similar painful experiences. Abi Sandoval is 67 years old when we meet at one of her favorite parks, at her suggestion, to do the interview. I will admit that the beautiful scenery that surrounded us, and the profoundly painful and intensely traumatic narrative Abi shared, created a jarring juxtaposition at times. Of all the interviews I conducted, Abi's life story left one of the greatest impressions on me. To this day I recall clearly what I can only describe as a sensation of waves of energy washing over me, energy that carried feelings of despair, grief, and anger that were not my own. Abi identified herself as a "gay," "soft butch lesbian" who was a racial "gumbo" and ethnically a "Hispanic Caucasian." She described her physical appearance as "look[ing] very Anglo." Abi is a disabled veteran who also worked many years in the United States Postal Service. She was born in New Orleans, which explains her reference to gumbo, but has lived the vast majority of her adult life in Texas; where she ultimately went on to earn a Master's degree in Social Work. Interestingly, even though Abi rails against institutionalized

religion, she considers herself a very spiritual, even religious, person, a topic that frequently wove itself throughout her life story.

During the course of our nearly three-hour conversation, Abi explains to me that she has been diagnosed with PTSD and has experienced two nervous breakdowns in her life, in which both times she attempted suicide. Abi's challenges with mental health are a result of the incredible trauma she has experienced and witnessed throughout her life. She faced incredible amounts of misogynistic and homophobic social harm in her job in the military and the postal service. Abi described daily verbal harassment from colleagues and supervisors, along with other various forms of antagonistic social harm. One of the greatest daily threats she lived with for *eight years* was the fear that Child Protective Services would take her daughter, Ana, away from her because of being a lesbian. When Ana was ten years old, her father and Abi's ex-husband, filed a report with CPS saying that Abi was a lesbian, which at the time, if substantiated, most likely would have resulted in Ana being taken away from her mother. If Abi's gay identity had been established by a CPS investigation, then her employer, the military at that time, could use it as evidence for a court marshal. Earlier in our conversation, Abi mentioned in passing she no longer had a relationship with her daughter, I later asked to return to that issue:

David: And you said you haven't had relationship with your daughter?

Abi: Since '96.

David: '96. Did she already have children by then?

Abi: No, she couldn't have children, and when I called about four or five years ago she works at Pikes Peak Community College, and I called her a week before Mother's Day, about four or five years ago. I don't remember exactly, and her voicemail, it was good to hear her voice, but it said she was on maternity leave, it was right before Mother's Day, and that was double hurt now. I got a granddaughter, and a mother I can't see, and a daughter, three of them. I started to write something that they've taken the sweetest

words: mother, daughter, granddaughter, those are sweet—family; mother, sister, those are really sweet words, they are not to me anymore they are hurtful words. So, um, I got really involved. I did have a couple of girlfriends during that time. [Dana (her girlfriend)] was four years, some of the others were a year and a half and, but I was functioning at a high level. Co-founding Stonewall Democrats, American Veterans for Equal Rights. Doing the only calendar in town for four years, about 3,000 copies a month. I delivered them. I had the letter career experience of how to make a route, boom, boom, to all the gay stores, and gay friendly stores, and that. So, yeah, your question is about?

David: About your daughter, so when she stopped speaking with you…

Abi: She wrote me a letter.

David: She wrote you a letter?

Abi: That I'm sure she was dictated to by her husband, because I left religion, and Catholicism I didn't raise her, in religion maybe that was a mistake looking back, because being raised in the catholic religion made all four of us [Abi and her siblings] not be religious, that being raised by nuns made us quit.

David: You, and your siblings?

Abi: Yeah, that was it I'm the most religious of them. I still go to church, but I didn't for about 30 years.

David: So, but your daughter is religious now?

Abi: She is, his religion, she got married, well it's hard to be at her church service to get her married, I had to wear a dress, and I had to be the mother of the bride. I don't wear dresses, I had a pink dress with pink shoes to wear, and he had already said hostile things to me. I had a gay pin one Christmas, he said he wanted to get his gun, and shoot me. She is married into something that, I told people she is marrying a Nazi, she got married at [United Baptist] church, because they thought Southern Baptist is too liberal. These are the kind of people that think a hundred forty-four thousand are going to heaven, and seven billion are going to hell, these are crazies. And he hates not just gays, he hates Mexicans, and Spaniards, which she looks more Irish than I do, but come on [Sandoval] is her mother, and he hates, he shoots cats, I'm an animal lover, my mother is an animal lover, my daughter was raised to be an animal lover, I just don't understand what she married him for? I really don't. All her friends including her maids of honor

> said, "he is despicable [Abi], and it's not about you [Abi], she's being taken away from us too." And when the husband, and wife [family friends], my daughter came here about eight years ago, they didn't see me, but they saw the friends who took care of her while I was having the breakdown in her high school.
>
> They told me—the mother, and the daughters, two daughters—told me, "[Abi], something is wrong with her and him, because even though we've been friends since we were eight years old, he wouldn't let us be alone with [Ana], he had to be present at every second, there's something really stalking about him." I mean, they're best friends, and they could not have a girl's day out. So, all three of them, the maid of honor, and the two girls that were raised with her said "it's not about you [Abi], it is not about you being gay it's something, and maybe your daughter is not safe with a guy that has got her like that." I don't know, but it may not even be about my being gay, but he sent me a letter that I know he wrote, because I didn't train her to know all the Bible quotes about gay people, and they are all written in there, it had to be from him. So, I created that affirm ministry, I want to hear Bible quotes in a different way, and I have, and I actually brought these two books, I have a book in my head, actually have two. I have to write. Somebody told me I have 25 of my poems, they said you should publish them, maybe with your story, and put the poem, and then the story, what do you think?

As is evident in this excerpt, Abi's delivery in the telling of her life story is rushed, going from one detail to the next, quickly pivoting from one topic or story to another; sometimes creating a challenge to just keep up with her in the moment. Abi's narrative style communicated a need to get out as many details and stories as possible, as if worried that it was not possible. In this portion of her life story narrative, we come to understand the tremendous amounts of social harm she has experienced from Ana, and especially from Ana's husband. The pain stemming from Ana's absence, which was well over 15 years by the time of our conversation, is tremendous; the silence and separation between mother and daughter has been so complete that Abi has had to live as if her daughter has passed away. It is clear that Abi assigns much of the blame for this complete breakdown of their relationship to her daughter's husband, who before she was disowned,

had threatened, harassed, and intimidated Abi. Her suspicions and distrust for her son-in-law seem to be confirmed by some of Ana's and other family friends.

Even though Ana's seemingly abusive relationship could account for the complete cutting-off of her mother, it does not explain all of the social harm evident in their relationship. Abi explains that Ana holds a lot of resentment towards her for being absent in her later childhood. It is not that Abi literally went missing from her daughter's life, but according to Abi, the CPS report caused her to break up with her then girlfriend and break all connections with the local lesbian and gay community she had become involved in. Abi went into a deep self-imposed exile. It is during this same time that Abi is receiving extraordinary amounts of workplace harassment, which is largely linked to the patriarchal and hegemonic masculine settings of the U.S. military and postal services. As mentioned earlier, this eventually took its toll on Abi's mental health. She explains that she understands how and why Ana would be upset with her. She empathizes and understands that any child would grow upset at their parent, especially with their mother, who becomes isolated and distant, even to their own child. Abi and Ana's pain is mediated through the patriarchal prescription that mothers are supposed to be ever present, primary caregivers that are self-sacrificing. Well, that is exactly what Abi did, and we can see first hand the deep and unfortunate consequences of hegemonic constructions of motherhood, especially Latina motherhood. Abi even shares a painful memory of being hospitalized during Ana's high school graduation, which she missed as a result. Through the application of a social harm lens, the multitude strands of pain and harm that bear down upon this one specific mother-daughter relationship—ranging from economic vulnerability and misogynistic and homophobic workplace harassment to intimate partner violence and racialized and patriarchal constructions of motherhood—

become visible and we are left with the question: how could this relationship ever have worked under these conditions and against these odds?

CONCLUSION

The current matrix of socio-legal structures we have in the United States, including the law and its attendant enforcers, are incapable of addressing and preventing most, if not all, of the forms of family-based racial social harm I have illustrated. This inability to intervene is a result for three primary reasons. First, the construction of what actions or inactions constitute illegal violence for which various state apparatuses may be mobilized is excessively narrow. Whether we are talking about police agencies, Child Protective Services, or a district attorney's office, the likelihood of any of these entities intervening is extremely low unless there is substantial evidence that a family's behavior seriously risks the physical wellbeing of one of its members. My research, for now, has indicated that the vast majority of family-based racial social harm would be characterized by many as emotional, psychological, or verbal abuse and maybe even neglect, but not necessarily unto the point of serious physical risk or harm. It is the lack of egregious physical violence that keeps family-based racial social harm invisible to those entities meant to protect. Second, for all intents and purposes racial social harm has been subsumed into the legal category of "hate crime" and rarely connected to social harm that occurs within the family. Hate crimes, and in particular racially motivated social harm, is often understood to occur between strangers or acquaintances, never between intimates such as family and friends. In fact, FBI guidelines (1999) for investigating a crime as a hate event, which have been adopted by most local police agencies, state that if the perpetrator and victim had any prior relationship or interaction to one another, then it is likely not a bias-motivated crime. In other words, familial relationships are understood to

lie outside the domain wherein racial social harm, as constructed, operates. The insistence through everyday legal and social practices that racial social harm only occurs in the most extreme and narrow of instances implicitly condones the fear, shame, anger, and isolation people like Andres Gaitan, Ezekiel Rodriguez, and Sonia Roman experience and bear witness to.

Given the historical and contemporary relationship of the U.S. nation-state, its laws and apparatuses, to Latin@ communities and families, I am frankly loathe to advocate a mere revision of statute or departmental policy as a sufficient solution to family-based racial social harm. As one of my project participants, Danni Guzman, reminded me at the end of our interview, the answers to these great social problems lie not within the confines of our current frameworks, but in the boundlessness of our imaginations. In a small effort to begin the mining of my own sociological imagination, I believe it is incumbent that we begin an effort to queer public policy. By queer, I am not referring to sexual identity, but rather to the theoretical notion or enterprise of destabilizing norms and traditions. Within conversations of the law and public policy, solutions amount to tinkering at the edges of prescribed ideas of what is and is not possible. I propose the idea that public policy should be considered as any social practice with a marked intent to change social dynamics and patterns. Public policy therefore is not a strict commodity of the state, rather communities can begin formulating public policies of their own to address family-based racial social harm that do not necessitate permission from the state.

The life stories of Octavio Quiñones and Abi Sandoval illustrate the many challenges of being a queer Latin@ parent. One of the critical lessons their narratives extol are the myriad pathways social harm practices and ideologies external to the family have to infiltrate, shape, and structure one of the central relationships in a TLGBQ

Latin@'s life, the parent-child relationship. Whether it is inter-generational family-based social harm, economic vulnerability, racial social harm, and/or anti-queer bias, all have the capability to produce social harm in mundane and unexpected ways in a relationship many would describe as sacred. I find the greatest lesson imbedded in Abi Sandoval's acutely mournful lament: "they've taken the sweetest words: mother, daughter, granddaughter, those are sweet—family; mother, sister, those are really sweet words, they are not to me anymore they are hurtful words." Her comment reflects the culturally and socially situated and constructed nature of this thing we have come to call "family." The cultural and social construction of the "family" is achieved through multiple discursive levels that take place in cultural production (e.g. pop culture, literature, music, etc.), public policy, social networks, and religious and educational institutions. This discursive form creates an idea of the family that is both ideal and controlling, which has a tremendous impact on TLGBQ Latin@ algorithms of pain. The family is constructed as a space that is implicitly safe, loving, and nurturing, critical elements in healthy human development. This in turn is internalized within individual and institutional algorithms of pain. It is evident within Abi, Octavio, Sonia, Ezekiel, and Andres' life stories that family-based social harm is particularly hurtful and deeply felt because the socially and culturally constructed expectations of what the family is are not met. In the simplest terms: family-based social harm is experienced as a fundamental betrayal, the breach of a sacred contract, which produces intense experiences of many forms of pain. Therefore, it is not surprising that this type of social harm plays such a significant role in TLGBQ Latin@ life stories.

CONCLUSION

The two conceptual pillars of this dissertation are *social harm* and *algorithms of pain*. Social harm was originally proposed in the late 1990s by British and European criminologists as an alternative concept to *crime* in order to forego statutory and juridical definitions and categories of harmful behavior. Crime is a contested category, a social construction that benefits the powerful, and as a result vast amounts of harmful behavior is not criminal even though they produce copious amounts of pain and suffering. The original articulation of social harm was vast, literally including all actions, inactions, and events that were perceived as harmful. The impetus for such a broad definition is understandable, but ultimately very difficult to maintain under social analysis. My original contributions to this literature, beyond focusing on a population that has until now, received no attention from criminologists or social harm researchers, is to anchor social harm specifically to those ideologies and practices that cause, enable, and emanate from the various hierarchical systems: white supremacy, patriarchy, transmisogyny, heterosexism, capitalism, xenophobia, ableism, anti-Semitism, and Islamophobia.

The primary intervention of social harm is to deconstruct institutional, disciplinary, popular, and individual epistemologies that on one hand artificially separate social harms into mutually exclusive categories of violence eliding their connections, and on the other render many forms of social harm invisible by excluding them from any category of social harm altogether. The starting assumption of my conceptualization of social harm, is that TLGBQ Latin@s perceive, react, and respond to social harm events not as individual moments but in the fusion of their totality. Thus, if the objective of understanding how queer Latin@s experience social harm, then it is imperative to

ascertain the connections and relationships they are making between these events and to their larger social context. This version of social harm necessarily utilizes and incorporates intersectionality as a cornerstone element of its analytical orientation; however, it's an intersectionality that is not only interested in the intersections of identity, but in the intersections of identity as they occur in spaces that are seemingly separated by space and time.

Social harm innovates upon traditional studies of racism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia, xenophobia, and class exploitation by being attentive to *all forms* of harm rooted in social inequality. This is why a life history perspective was incorporated and life story interviewing selected as the method for this project. In constructing their testimonio, TLGBQ Latin@s not only tell us about themselves, but they create meaning through the mixing, blending, and synthesis of events and moments in their life journeys. This process of meaning making supplies critical information and knowledge about how social harms are operating individually, colluding together, and shaping the social world around queer Latin@s.

Accessing all of the relevant information or knowledge about social harm is not a straightforward process when analyzing TLGBQ Latin@ life stories, whether individually or collectively. Queer Latin@s are complex; Avery Gordon (1997) reminds us that

> Complex personhood means that all people…remember and forget, are beset by contradiction, and recognize and misrecognize themselves and others…Complex personhood means that stories people tell about themselves, about their troubles, about their social worlds, and about their society's problems are entangled and weave between what is immediately available as a story and what their imaginations are reaching toward…At the very least, complex personhood is about conferring the respect on others that comes from presuming that life and people's lives are simultaneously straightforward and full of enormously subtle meaning. (p. 4-5)

If we do not construct our theoretical explanations and analysis with the flexibility and elasticity to work with and within the many contours of what is human life, then we run the very real risk of simply producing a distorted representation—much like those caricature drawings you can purchase at fairs, festivals, and theme parks. It is with this need in mind and from the infinitely multifaceted details and meanings generously provided by 26 TLGBQ Latin@ people in their life story narratives that I have developed the theory of *algorithms of pain*.

Algorithms of pain operate as both an investigatable social phenomenon—as demonstrated in Chapter 1—and as an analytical lens to understand and interpret TLGBQ Latin@ life stories—as illustrated in the third and fourth chapters. At its most basic, an algorithm of pain represents the very complex evaluation process TLGBQ Latin@s engage in that structures their experiences of pain and ultimately social harm. The focus on pain is two fold, first, I argue that pain is a fundamental consequence of social harm; and second, the perception of pain is a critical and universal human task because pain in its most basic function is to inform that something is not right and should, if possible, be avoided or corrected. TLGBQ Latin@s do not have universal experiences of pain, meaning they do not all experience a social harm event in the same way. As with the case study of Susana Blake and Rodrigo Salas, TLGBQ Latin@ may register a collective sense of pain in regards to a shared event, but that does not mean the perception, experience, and ultimately the representation of that pain is the same.

Whether narratives of pain between or among TLGBQ Latin@s are different, similar, or the same they all provide extremely useful knowledge about social harm and the social dynamics and forces that produce them. An additional part of the benefit of identifying algorithms of pain is their propensity to shape attitudes and behaviors. Nadia Abbasi's algorithm of pain motivates her to avoid cisgender men, Octavio Quiñones'

algorithm leads him to pursue a second career as an HIV/AIDS educator, and Danni Guzman's algorithm produces tremendous levels of distrust of the state and shapes her political ideology and activism. Algorithms of pain are not limited to individuals, they do manifest themselves collectively and institutionally. *Harm management*, the state's function in and relationship to social harm, represents the institutionalization of an algorithm of pain. This algorithm of pain however, is rooted in the social formations of whiteness, hegemonic masculinity, cisgenderness, compulsory heterosexuality, citizen, and elite. Harm management's rootedness in the multiple forms of privilege then form a state that is antagonistic and harmful to TLGBQ Latin@s, along with many other minoritized populations.

What are the implications then of all that has been learned from these TLGBQ Latin@ life stories? Where do we go then in a practical and applied sense with the framework of social harm and the theory of algorithms of pain?

The paths forward I believe are many, but I would like to focus on two particular pathways. First, we must divest ourselves from the idea that the nation-state has primacy in the area of preventing and eliminating social harm. Neither, however, can we invest in the naïveté of a politics that solely critiques and rejects the state as a necessary institution within human civilization. Instead, social harm and algorithms of pain ask for a queered view of public policy. By queer, I am not referring to sexual identity, but rather to the theoretical notion or enterprise of destabilizing norms and traditions. Within conversations of the law and public policy, solutions amount to tinkering at the edges of prescribed ideas of what is and is not possible. I propose the idea that public policy should be defined as any social practice with a marked intent to change social dynamics and patterns. Public policy therefore is not a strict commodity of the state, rather communities can begin formulating public policies of their own to address various the

forms of social harm that affect them but do not necessitate permission from the state. A great example of this queer approach to public policy is the Audre Lorde Project, a queer people of color organization based in Brooklyn, NY. One of their main projects is the Safe OUTside the System Collective (S.O.S.), which seeks to effect greater levels of public safety for queer people of color by engaging organizations and businesses that operate public spaces how they can build safer environments for queer people of color and how they can safely intervene when violent situations develop. Their project expands the notion of whose responsibility it is for maintaining and ensuring public safety.

Second, algorithms of pain highlight the integral nature of emotion to the experience and representation of all forms of social harm. Discourses surrounding social harm, whether they are about racism, sexism, heterosexism, transmisogyny or any system of subordination are replete with emotional content. Whether in the classroom, legislative halls, courtrooms, on the street, or in news programs, so little headway is made towards equality and equity for many reasons, but one of those impediments is our inability to deal with pain, whether it's the pain of TLGBQ Latin@s, other marginalized groups, or even the pain of privileged groups and individuals. Developing and evolving our individual, collective, and institutional capacities for radical empathy (Cohen 2010) can facilitate the necessary connection that is essential for meaningful and permanent social transformation that unseats and over time will deconstruct and finally eliminate the systems of power and exclusion that continually produce pain and suffering.

This dissertation obviously does not represent all there is to say about TLGBQ Latin@s and social harm. Part of this is due to the restrictions on length and space within a single dissertation; however, beyond this there are methodological limitations of the study that prevent particular insights. One of these is the absence of immigrant, Afro-Latin@, and Latino transman (Ezekiel Rodriguez being the one exception) in the sample

of collected life stories. Although many second generation Latin@s participated whose testimonios contain mentions of xenophobic social harm, they cannot speak directly to the experience of being situated as an immigrant—with or without documents—to the state. The forms of social harm and the attendant varieties of pain rooted in the experience of being Afro-Latin@ fall outside of the empirical and theoretical analysis offered here because unfortunately none were recruited during the course of data collection. Even though there was good diversity in gender identity and expression overall amongst participants, there was an extremely low recruitment yield of transmen. Beyond particular gaps in identities represented within the sample of life stories, an additional limitation of the overall project stems of its focus on TLGBQ Latin@ in Texas. I am unable to conclude, or even speculate, what, if any, differences exist between TLGBQ Latin@s in Texas versus other areas of the U.S., especially in California, Florida, New York/New Jersey, and upper Midwest. The particular histories of these specific locations as they relate to Latin@ and TLGBQ populations may have important impacts on the manifestation of social harm and the experience of it. Despite these limitations, this project contributes in some significant ways to the discipline of sociology.

This dissertation makes two major interventions in several fields of sociology. My first intervention is the use of social harm, instead of related concepts like social inequality, hate crime, and discrimination. The use of social harm creates an ethical imperative that resists the normalizing force that often accompanies the use of social inequality. Social harm also removes us from academic and legal terms that analytically segregate various forms of social harm from one another, as if they are not sociologically related to one another, often in very intimate ways. I do not argue that we should forego all instances of studying specific categories of social harm; what I argue against is the

tendency to rarely bring all forms of social harm under analytical scrutiny simultaneously. In fact, it is only by doing this that observing algorithms of pain is even possible. If social harm were not adopted, then this meaning-making practice by TLGBQ Latin@s would remain invisible and unknown.

This brings me to the second major contribution of this dissertation project: the development of algorithms of pain and its intervention within the sociology of emotion. By situating DuBois within the intellectual lineage of the sociology of emotion and centering the life stories of TLGBQ Latin@s, the centrality of race and racism to the structure, shape, and use of emotions becomes very apparent. Algorithms of pain not only illustrates that emotions are important to the reproduction of social harm, but they are an artifact themselves of the totality of social harm TLGBQ Latin@s experience; meaning pain is and should be understood as a function of the *intersection of all* systems of subordination that privilege a few and harm most. Lastly, algorithms of pain provides a departure from traditional notions that they are the result of feeling rules and emotion management, which often get represented as conscious processes. Algorithms of pain incorporate the possibilities and realities of the human sub- and unconscious in cataloguing social experiences and deriving social meaning; this is best observed in my discussion of racial utterances. Algorithms of pain eschews prioritizing purely cultural, cognitive, or embodied notions of emotions; rather it understands that emotions, especially pain, is rooted in all of these locations within the human experience along with the sub- and unconscious mind.

Appendix A: Life Story Interview Guides

English Version

I. Beginning Activity (Approximately 10 minutes)
   a. Today I would like us to begin with a short activity that we will do together. I have for each of us two sheets of paper in addition to markers, pens, color pencils, glue, scissors, glitter, and construction paper. On one piece of paper we will use these materials to answer the statement: "I feel safe when _(fill in the blank)_." On the other piece of paper we will use these materials to answer the statement: "For the world to be a safe place _(fill in the blank)_ needs to happen." You can use pictures, symbols, words, or just write.
   b. *Remember to label each sheet appropriately to know which one is a response to which statement*.
   c. Can you describe and explain for me what you created as an answer to the statement: "I feel safe when _(fill in the blank)_."
   d. Can you describe and explain for me what you created as an answer to the statement: "For the world to be a safe place _(fill in the blank)_ needs to happen."
   e. I would like to share with you what I created, but if you don't mind could we wait until the end of the interview? I ask this because I do not want what I have to say to influence any of your responses. Is this okay?

II. Interviewee's Basic Biographical Information – I would like to first start with some basic questions about your background.
   a. Interviewee's Info
      1) What is the date of your birth?
      2) Where were you born?
         a) If immigrated, when did you arrive in the U.S.?
         b) Were you raised in this place? If no, then where?
      3) What was the highest level of education you completed?
      4) How do your currently earn money?
         a) Are you currently employed? If unemployed, for how long?
         b) What would you say is your occupation?
      5) How would you identify your race?
         a) How would you describe your color?
      6) How would you identify your ethnicity?
      7) How you would describe your sexual identity?
      8) How would you describe or identify your gender?
   b. Parents/Guardians' Info
      1) What year was your mother/father/guardian born?
      2) Where was your mother/father/guardian born?

        a) If immigrated, when did your mother/father/guardian arrive in the U.S.?
    3) What was the highest level of education completed by your mother/father/guardian?
    4) Is your mother/father/guardian currently employed? If unemployed, for how long?
        a) What is your mother/father/guardian's occupation?
    5) Does your mother/father/guardian have the same racial identity as you?
        a) Is your mother/father/guardian lighter, darker, or same in color as you?
    6) Does your mother/father/guardian have the same ethnic identity as you?
c. Siblings Info
    1) Do you have siblings? How many?
    2) What year was your sibling(s) born?
    3) Where was your sibling born?
        a) If immigrated, when did your sibling(s) arrive in the U.S.?
    4) What was the highest level of education completed by your sibling(s)?
    5) Is your sibling(s) currently employed? If unemployed, for how long?
        a) What is your sibling(s)' occupation?
    6) Does your sibling(s) have the same racial identity as you?
        a) Is your sibling(s) lighter, darker, or same in color as you?
    7) Does your sibling(s) have the same ethnic identity as you?
    8) Does your sibling(s) have the same sexual identity as you?
    9) Does your sibling(s) have the same gender expression as you?

III. Childhood – Thank you for providing all of that basic biographical information. If it is okay with you, I would like to now talk about what your life has been like up to this point, starting with your early childhood. Is this okay?
a. What was your early childhood like? What do you remember most from this period of your life?
b. Can you describe the neighborhood you lived in at this time? What was it like?
    1) Racially diverse?
    2) Economically diverse?
    3) Other children of the same age around?
    4) Did you like the neighborhood?
c. Were you involved in any organized activities at this time?
    1) Church?
    2) Sports?
    3) Summer camps?
    4) Other activities (i.e. Girl Scouts/Boy Scouts)?
d. Were you aware of your racial and/or ethnic identity at this time of your life? If yes, how?

e. Were you aware of your sexual and/or gender identity at this time of your life? If yes, how?
f. Were there any times during your early childhood when you felt secure and safe? If yes, could you please describe these times?
g. Were there any times during your early childhood when you were fearful or scared? If yes, could you please describe these times?

IV. Adolescence (12-18)
a. What was your life like during your adolescence?
b. What was your relationship like with…
    1) mother/father/guardian?
    2) sibling(s)?
    3) other family?
    4) teachers?
    5) classmates?
    6) neighbors?
c. Can you describe for me what brought you joy during this time? Why did these things bring you joy?
d. Can you share with me the challenges you faced during this time? Were you ever harmed in some way? Family? School? Work? Friends? Police?
e. Do you recall a time when you may have done something or chose to not do something that ended up hurting or harming someone else? If yes, what happened and why?
f. Did you have a positive association with your racial/ethnic identity during this time of your life?
    1) If yes, what contributed to this positive association?
    2) If no, what was difficult?
g. Did you have a positive association with your gender/sexual identity during your adolescence?
    1) If yes, what contributed to this positive association?
    2) If no, what was difficult?
h. We have come to the end of the questions about your childhood and adolescent years. Before we start the next section of questions I want to ask: is there any event, or anything that happened during the early part of your life, that we have not discussed so far but is related to the topics we have been discussing and you think I should know?

V. Young Adulthood (19-29)
a. What do you remember the most about your young adult years?
b. Were there places, spaces, or moments where you felt more safe or affirmed?
    1) What made these spaces safer or more affirming?
    2) Did you make a conscious effort to be in these places or spaces more?
    3) Did you make an effort to avoid particular spaces or places?

c. During these years, did an organization or individual ever harm you? If yes, what were these experiences?
d. Are there any moments during this period of time that you associate with the feeling of shame, fear, and/or anxiety? If yes, could you describe these moments?
e. Were there any events or moments during your young adulthood that made you think or feel differently about your childhood and adolescence?
f. During this time, do you recall any moments of struggle related to sexuality?
g. Any moments of struggle related to race/ethnicity?
h. Any struggles around gender or gender expression?
i. Do you think society affirms all of your identities?
    1) Are you affirmed at work?
    2) Do you feel your friends affirm all of whom you are?
    3) Does your family affirm you?

VI. Adulthood (30-50)
a. What were some of the major events that occurred during your adult years?
b. What were the moments or events when you felt fulfilled and affirmed as a person? Why do you think these moments or events were fulfilling or affirming?
c. Were there times where you felt you were denied an opportunity? If so, when and why?
d. Can you recall a time when you did or might have harmed another person?
e. When you are angry, upset, or frustrated how do you deal with the situation? Examples?
f. During this time were there ever places you were at least a little nervous being in?
g. What experiences, if any, that you had during this period of your life change your perspective about previous times or events in your life?

VII. Later Adulthood (51+)
a. What memories stand out for you since turning 51 years old?
b. Are there any new insecurities or worries that you have now that you did not have previously in your life? If so, what are they?
c. Are there things you used to fear or get angry about, but no longer do? If so, what and why?
d. When and where do you feel most yourself? Why?
e. Do you feel all of your identities are affirmed by society?
f. Looking back on your life, which times you have been hurt stand out the most for you?

VIII. Ideas about Violence
a. How would you define or describe violence?

b. Do you think your definition of violence is one that most other people would agree with? In your organization?
c. Do you think the police would agree with your definition?
d. Is violence and discrimination the same thing or are they different? Why?
e. Have you forgiven the people who have hurt you? Why or why not?
f. How does a person heal from the physical, emotional, psychological, or spiritual pain they have gone through? Have you gone through this process?

IX. Ideas about Hate Crime
a. How would you define or describe hate crime?
b. Do you think your definition of hate crime is the one that most other people would agree with?
c. Do you think the police and district attorney would agree with your definition?
d. Would you label any of your experiences as a hate crime? Why or why not?
e. Have you ever reported any of your experiences to the police? Why or why not?
f. Are laws that punish hate crimes important to you? Why or why not?
g. Are you familiar with or have you ever heard about the murders of Norma and María Hurtado? If so, what have been your feelings and opinions about their murder and the events that have happened since then?

X. Miscellaneous Final Questions
a. Why did you decide to participate in this project?
b. Is there a question that I did not ask that you think would have been interesting, difficult, or controversial for you to answer?
c. Was there a question I asked you, which was especially difficult for you to answer?
d. Is there a topic that we did not cover today that you believe is important to share with me?

Versión Español (Spanish Version)

I. Actividad inicial (Aproximadamente 10 minutos)
a. Quiero empezar nuestro sesión con una actividad breve que haremos juntos. Tengo dos hojas de papel para cada uno de nosotros y támbien plumas, plumones, lapices colorados, pegamento, brillo, tijeras, y papel de construcción. En una de las hojas usaremos estos materiales para responder a la declaración: "Siento seguro cuando _(rellena el espacio en blanco)_." En la otra hoja de papel usaremos estos materiales para responder a la otra declaración: "Para el mundo ser un lugar seguro _(rellena el espacio en blanco)_ necesito ocurir." Ud. puede dibujar, usar simbolos, palabras, o simplemente escribir su respuesta a cada declaración.

b. *No olvide etiquetar cada hoja para saber cual declaración es una respuesta para.*
c. ¿Describa y explica que creo para su respuesta a la declaración: "Siento seguro cuando (rellena el espacio en blanco) ."?
d. ¿Describe y explica que creo para su respuesta a la declaracíon: "Para el mundo ser un lugar seguro (rellena el espacio en blanco) necesito ocurir."
e. Quiero compartir con Ud. lo que creé para mis respuestas, pero si Ud. está de acuerdo quiero esperar hasta el final de la entrevista para compartir mis dibujos porque no quiero influir sus respuestas para el resto de nuestro conversación. ¿Ud. está de acuerdo?

II. Información biográfica básica de el/la estrevistad@ - quiero empezar la entrevista con unas preguntas básicas sobre su origen.
   a. Información de el/la entrevistad@
      i. ¿Cuál es la fecha de su nacimiento?
      ii. ¿Donde nacío?
         1. Si Ud. inmigró, ¿cuándo llego en los Estados Unidos?
         2. ¿Ud. fui criado en este lugar? Si no, ¿entonces donde fui criado?
      iii. ¿Cuál es el nivel superior de educación Ud. ha cumplido?
      iv. ¿Cómo gana Ud. dinero?
         1. ¿Ud. está empleado ahora? Si no, ¿por cuánto tiempo has estado desempleado?
         2. ¿Qué es su ocupación? ¿Cómo la describe?
      v. ¿Cómo identifica Ud. en cuanto a raza?
         1. ¿Cómo describiría Ud. su color?
      vi. ¿Cómo identifica Ud. en cuanto a etnicidad?
      vii. ¿Cómo identifica Ud. en cuanto a orientación sexual?
      viii. ¿Cómo identifica o describa Ud. en cuanto a su género?
   b. Información de los padres/guardianes
      i. ¿En que año nació su madre/padre/guardián?
      ii. ¿Donde nació su madre/padre/guardián?
         1. Si inmigróa, ¿en que año llego su madre/padre/guardián a los Estados Unidos?
      iii. ¿ Cuál es el nivel superior de educación que ha cumplido su madre/padre/guardián?
      iv. ¿Está empleado su madre/padre/guardián? Si no, ¿por cuánto tiempo ha estado desempleado?
         1. ¿Qué es la ocupación de su madre/padre/guardián?
      v. ¿Tiene su madre/padre/guardián la misma raza cómo Ud.?
         1. ¿Tiene su madre/padre/guardián piel más oscura, clara, o el mismo color que Ud.?
      vi. ¿Tiene su madre/padre/guardián la misma etnicidad que Ud.? Si no, ¿qué es la etnicidad de su madre/padre/guardián?

c. Información de los hermanos y las hermanas
    i. ¿Tiene Ud. hermanos o hermanas? Cuantos/as?
    ii. ¿En que año nació su(s) hermano(s)/a(s)?
    iii. ¿Donde nació su(s) hermano(s)/a(s)?
        1. Si inmigro/inmigraron, ¿cuándo llego/llegaron su(s) hermano(s)/a(s) en los Estados Unidos?
    iv. ¿Cuál es el nivel superior de educación su(s) hermano(s)/a(s) ha(n) cumplido?
    v. ¿Está(n) empleado su(s) hermano(s)/a(s)? Si no, ¿Por cuánto tiempo ha(n) estado desempleado?
        1. ¿Qué es/son la(s) ocupación(es) de su(s) hermano(s)/a(s)?
    vi. ¿Tiene(n) su(s) hermano(s)/a(s) la misma raza cómo Ud.?
        1. ¿Tiene su(s) hermano(s)/a(s) piel más oscuro, clara o el mismo color que Ud.?
    vii. ¿Tiene(n) su(s) hermano(s)/a(s) la misma etnicidad que Ud.?
    viii. ¿Tiene(n) su(s) hermano(s)/a(s) la misma orientación sexual que Ud.?
    ix. ¿Tiene(n) su(s) hermano(s)/a(s) la misma expresión de género que Ud.? Si no, ¿cómo es diferente?

III. Niñez – Gracias por dar toda tu información biográfica básica. Si tu estás de acuerdo, quiero empezar con preguntas sobre tu niñez, especificamente de los años 0 hasta 11. ¿Estás de acuerdo? Acuerdate, no necesitas responder a cada pregunta si no recuerdes o es demasiado dificíl para hablar de esa tema. Okay?
    a. ¿Cómo fueron los años de tu niñez? ¿Qué recuerdas la más desde esté período?
    b. ¿Puedes describir el barrio donde viviste durante esté tiempo? ¿Cómo fue el barrio?
        i. ¿Había mucha gente de diferentes razas?
        ii. ¿Había mucha gente de diferentes niveles economicos?
        iii. ¿Habían niños/as de la misma edad?
        iv. ¿Legustaste esté barrio?
    c. ¿Participaste en actividades organizados en tu niñez?
        i. ¿En la iglesia?
        ii. ¿Deportes?
        iii. ¿Campamento de verano?
        iv. ¿Otras actividades (i.e. Girl Scouts/Boy Scouts)?
    d. ¿Tuviste conciencia de tu raza o etnicidad? ¿Cómo diste cuenta de tu raza y etnicidad?
    e. ¿Tuviste conciencia de tu sexualidad o género durante estes años? En caso afirmativo, ¿cómo?
    f. ¿Habían tiempos durante tu niñez donde sentiste seguro(a) o apoyado? En caso afirmativo, ¿por favor, describes estas tiempos?

g. ¿Al revés, habían tiempos donde tuviste miedo o estuviste temeroso(a) o muy triste? En caso afirmtivo, ¿por favor, si estás comfortable, describes estas momentos?

IV. Adolescencia (12-18) – con tu permiso, quiero continuar ahora con preguntas de tu adolescencia, especificamente de los años 12 hasta 18. ¿Tengo tu permiso?
   a. ¿Cómo se fue tu vida durante tu adolescencia? ¿Cómo la describes?
   b. ¿Cómo había tu relación con tu(s)…
      i. tu madre/padre/guardián?
         tus hermanos y hermanas?
      ii. tu otra familia?
      iii. tus maestras y maestros?
      iv. tus compañeros/as de clase?
      v. tus vecinas/os?
   c. ¿Puedes describir que fueron fuentes de alegría, júbilo, y deleite? ¿Por qué estas cosas o personas fueron fuentes de alegría, júbilo, y deleite?
   d. ¿Puedes compartir conmigo los desafíos que encontraste durante tu adolescencia? [PARA POR UNA RESPUESTA] ¿Experimentaste daño de una forma u otra? ¿de tu familia? ¿de la escuela? ¿en el trabajo? ¿de tus amigos/as? ¿de un(a) novio(a)? ¿de la policia?
   e. ¿Describes, por favor, un momento durante este tiempo donde tú haciste o decidiste a no hacer algo que tuviera una consecuencia negativa para otra persona? En caso afirmativo, que pasó y por qué?
   f. ¿Desde 12 hasta 18 años de edad, tuviste una buena opinión de tu raza/etnicidad? ¿Tuviste orgullo en tus raices?
      i. En caso afirmativo, ¿cuáles son las razones que tuviste buena autoestima en relacion de tu raza y etnicidad?
      ii. Si no, ¿qué fueron los desafíos que previnieron una opinión positiva?
   g. ¿Durante esta misma edad, tuviste una buena opinión de tu sexualidad o género?
      i. En caso afirmativo, ¿qué contribuyó a esta buena opinión?
      ii. Si no, ¿por qué fue dificil a tener una buena opinión de tu sexualidad o género?
   h. Estamos al final de las preguntas sobre tu juventud y niñez. ¿Antes que empezamos la próxima sección, quiero preguntar si hay algo o un evento durante este período relacionado a las temas que hemos cubierto que no hemos discutido pero debo saber?

V. Adultez temprana (19-29) – Ahora quiero preguntarte sobre tu adultez temprana, especificamente de los años 19 hasta 29. ¿Está bien para continuar?
   a. ¿Que recuerdes lo más cuando fuiste 19 hasta 29 años de edad? ¿Cómo describirías esta época de tu vida?
   b. ¿Habían lugares, espacios, o momentos donde sentiste más seguro o afirmado?
      i. ¿Por qué esos lugares y espacios estuven más seguro o afirmando?

ii. ¿Hiciste una decisión intencionalmente para estar en esos lugares y espacios?
iii. ¿Hiciste un esfuerzo para evitar esos lugares y espacios? En caso afirmativo, ¿cómo los evitaste? En caso negativo, ¿por qué no los evitaste?

c. Durante esta época, ¿habían organizaciones o personas que te hizo daño o almo malo? En caso afirmativo, ¿puedes describir estas experiencias?
d. ¿Hubiera momentos en este período que recuerdes con vergüenza, temor, o preocupación? En caso afirmativo, ¿por favor describes estos momentos?
e. ¿Tuvieras momentos en tu adultez temprana que cambiaron la manera en que tu pensabas o sentías sobre tu niñez o juventud?
f. ¿Puedes recordar forcejeos con tu sexualidad durante este tiempo?
g. ¿Tuvieras, en este período, momentos de forcejeo a razón de raza y etnicidad?
h. ¿Tuvieras forcejeos relacionado a tu género o expresión de género?
i. ¿Durante tu adultez temprana, crees que la sociedad afirma todas tus identidades sociales?
   i. ¿Estuviste afirmado en el trabajo?
   ii. ¿Sentiste que tus amigos/as afirmaron quien eres?
   iii. ¿Te afirmó la familia?

VI. Adultez (30-50) –quiero seguir preguntado sobre tu adultez, pero a ahora quiero que te piensas de 30 hasta 50 años de edad. ¿Podemos continuar?
   a. ¿Qué son los eventos y momentos que recuerdas de tu adultez empezando a los 30 años has 50años de edad? ¿Cómo describirías esta época de tu vida?
   b. ¿Cuál momentos o eventos sintieron afirmando para ti? ¿Por qué fueron afirmando?
   c. ¿Habían momentos donde sintías o pensabas que estuviste negado una oportunidad? En caso afirmativo, ¿cuándo y por qué?
   d. ¿Puesdes recordar una vez cuando le hiciste daño, con seguridad o posiblemente, a otra(s) persona(s)? En caso afirmativo, ¿puesdes compartir estas momentos?
   e. ¿Durante este período, como manejaste situaciones donde estabas enojado y frustrado? ¿Qué son algunos ejemplos?
   f. ¿Entre los edades de 30 y 50, habían momentos donde estabas en un lugar donde sentiste nervioso? Describes estes momentos, por favor.
   g. ¿Hay experiencias durante este tiempo que cambiaron la manera en que pensabas o sentías sobre eventos que pasaron anteriormente? ¿Qué son estos momentos y cómo te han afectado?

VII. Later Adulthood (51+) – quiero empezar ahora una sección de preguntas que cubre tu adulteza posterior, especificamente los años 51 hasta el presente. ¿Podemos seguir?
   a. Hasta que tu cumpliste 51 años, ¿cuáles son las memorias que destacan de las demas?

b. ¿Tienes nuevas inseguridades o preocupaciones que no tuviste anteriormente? En caso afirmativo, que son?
c. ¿Hay cosas que te hiciera enojado o temoroso(a), pero ahora no afectas en esa manera? En caso afirmativo, ¿que son esas cosas y por qué cambiaste?
d. ¿Cuándo y a donde sientes cómo más usted mismo? ¿Dónde o cuando sientes cómo un humano entero? ¿Por qué?
e. ¿Sientes que la sociedad se afirma todas tus identidades sociales?
f. ¿Contemplando a toda tu vida, cuáles son los momentos de daño que te han afectado la más?

VIII. Ideas sobre la violencia – ya estamos terminados con preguntas sobre tu historia. Ahora yo solamente tengo unas preguntas sobre las temas de violencia y crimenes de odio. ¿Puedo seguir con éstas preguntas?
a. ¿Cómo definirías o describirías violencia?
b. ¿Crees que tu definición de violencia es una que la mayoridad de gente estaría de acuerdo con?
c. ¿Crees que la policia estaría de acuerdo con tu definición de violencia?
d. ¿Crees que la violencia y la discriminación son la misma cosa o son diferente? ¿Por qué?
e. ¿Has perdonado la gente que le hizo daño a ti? ¿Por qué sí o no?
f. ¿Cómo puede sanar una persona del dolor física, emocional, psicológico, o espiritual que ha experimentado? ¿Has sanado del dolor que has experimentado?

IX. Ideas de crimenes de odio
a. ¿Cómo definirías o describirías crimen de odio?
b. ¿Crees que tu definición de crimen de odio es una que la mayoridad de gente estaría de acuerdo con?
c. ¿Crees que la policia y el fiscal de distrito estaría de acuerdo con tu definición de violencia?
d. ¿Identificarías cualquiera de tus experiencias cómo un crimen de odio? ¿Por qué sí o no?
e. ¿Has reportado cualquiera experiencia a la policia? ¿Por qué sí o no?
f. ¿Son importante las leyes que castigan los crimenes de odio? ¿Por qué sí o no?
g. ¿Crees que las leyes que castigan los crimenes de odio son efectivas en prevenir este tipo de crimen?
h. ¿Estás familiarizado con o has oído hablar de los asesinatos de Norma y María Hurtado? En caso afirmativo, ¿qué han sido tus sentimientos y opiniones sobre estos asesinatos y los eventos siguiendo?

X. Preguntas finales – ya estamos casí terminado con la entrevista. Yo solamente tengo cuatro preguntas breves sobre nuestra conversación.
e. ¿Por qué decidiste participar en esta investigación?

f. ¿Hay alguna(s) pregunta(s) que no te haya preguntado, pero crees hubiera sido interesante, difícil, o controvertido de contestar?
g. ¿Hay alguna pregunta que pregunté que haya sido difícil de contestar?
h. ¿Hay algún tema sobre la violencia y identidad que no tuvimos la oportunidad de discutir, pero quieres que yo lo sepa?

Appendix B: Stakeholder Interview Guide

I. Interviewee's Basic Biographical Information – I would like to first start with some basic questions about your background.
   a. What is the date of your birth?
   b. Where were you born?
      i. If immigrated, when did you arrive in the U.S.?
      ii. Were you raised in this place? If no, then where?
   c. What was the highest level of education you have completed?
   d. How would you identify your race?
      i. How would you describe your color?
   e. How would you identify your ethnicity?
   f. How you would describe your sexual identity?
   g. How would you describe or identify your gender?

II. Relevant Role: Job/Volunteer Position
   a. What is your current job/volunteer position?
   b. How long have you been in this position? How long have you been with this organization/agency?
   c. What are the duties and responsibilities of your job/volunteer position?
   d. What is the mission of the organization/agency that you work/volunteer for?
   e. Who do you consider as the primary constituents or stakeholders you serve?

III. Violence
   a. How would you define or describe violence?
   b. Do you think your definition of violence is one that most other people would agree with? Why or why not?
   c. [IF PERSON IS NOT WITH A POLICE DEPARTMENT] Do you think the police would agree with your definition? Why or why not?
   d. Is violence the same as discrimination or are they different? Why?
   e. Have you experienced violence ever? If so, would you mind explaining?
   f. Do you think there is a relationship between social identity and the experience of violence?
   g. Do you think Latin@s who are transgender, lesbian, gay, bisexual, or queer encounter unique challenges as it relates to violence? Why or why not?

IV. Hate Crime
   a. How would you define or describe a hate crime?
   b. Do you think your definition of hate crime is the one that most other people would agree with? Why or why not?
   c. [IF PERSON IS NOT WITH A POLICE DEPARTMENT OR D.A.] Do you think the police and district attorney would agree with your definition? Why or why not?

d. Are laws that punish hate crimes important to you? Why or why not?
e. Are hate crime laws effective in dealing with this kind of violence?
f. Are there any challenges with regards to the implementation of hate crime laws?
g. In your opinion, what kinds of evidence are sufficient to establish that a crime was motivated, at least in part, because of some social identity like race, sexuality, or gender?
h. Are you familiar with the case of the murder of María and Norma Hurtado? If so, what is your opinion or observation of that event and the events that have followed?
i. Do you believe TLGBQ Latin@s have a greater probability of experiencing a hate crime relative to other groups?

V. Miscellaneous Final
a. Why did you decide to participate in this project?
b. Is there a question that I did not ask that you think would have been interesting, difficult, or controversial for you to answer?
c. Was there a question I asked you, which was especially difficult for you to answer?
d. Is there a topic that we did not cover today that you believe is important to share with me?

Appendix C: Recruitment Language

LIFE STORY PARTICIPANTS
English Version

Volunteer for a Research Study!
Violence/Harm and Transgender, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Queer Latina & Latino Experiences

The Purpose

The purpose of this research project is to better understand the experiences of Latin@ transgender, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer people who experience harm/violence in their lives because of who they are. The study seeks to understand what harm/violence people have encountered throughout their life, when and why they have felt safer or affirmed, and their opinions about harm/violence in society.

What You Are Volunteering For?

A confidential, audio recorded two and a half (2.5) hour interview. A $25.00 VISA gift card will be given to all participants who complete the interview.

Where Is The Interview?

At a safe location the volunteer chooses.

Am I Qualified To Volunteer?

If you can answer "Yes" to all of the following questions, then you are able to volunteer:

1) Are you of Latin American descent?
2) Are you transgender, lesbian, gay, bisexual, or queer?
3) Have you experienced some type of harm/violence because of who you are?
4) Are you at least 18 years old?
5) Do you currently live in the state of Texas?
6) If an immigrant, have you lived in the United States for at least five (5) years?

This study has been approved by The University of Texas at Austin Institutional Review Board.

If you are interested in volunteering to be interviewed and would like more information, please contact David Glisch-Sánchez by e-mail at glisch.sanchez@gmail.com

Versión Español (Spanish Version)

¡Participe en un estudio de investigación!
Las experiencias de violencia en las vidas de latinas y latinos transgénero, lesbiana, gay, o bisexual.

Objetivo

El propósito de esta investigación es entender las experiencias de las latinas y los latinos transgénero, lesbiana, gay, o bisexual que han experimentado daño/violencia en sus vidas. La investigación quiere documentar los tipos de daño/violencia que las personas han experimentado durante toda la vida, cuando y porque han sentido más seguro ó afirmado, y sus opiniones sobre el daño y la violencia que hay en la sociedad.

¿Qué hará Ud. si desea participar en ésta investigación?

Participar en una entrevista que será confidencial y grabado por dos horas y media (2.5 horas). Cada persona que termina la entrevista recibirá una VISA tarjeta de regalo que vale $25.00.

¿Dónde será la entrevista?

En un lugar seguro y privado que el voluntario o la voluntaria prefiera y escoja.

¿Califico yo para el estudio?

Si Ud. contesta con un "Sí" a las siguientes preguntas, puede participar en el estudio:

1) ¿Tiene Ud. herencia latinoamericana?
2) ¿Es Ud. transgénero, lesbiana, gay o bisexual?
3) ¿Ha experimentado Ud. violencia u otro tipo de daño porque ser quien es?
4) ¿Tiene Ud. a lo menos 18 años?
5) ¿Vive Ud. en el estado de Texas?
6) Si es inmigrante, ¿ha vivido Ud. en los Estados Unidos a lo menos 5 años?

Esté proyecto ha sido aprobado por la Comisión de Revisión Institucional de la Universidad de Tejas en Austin.

Si esta Ud. Interesada(o) a participar en la entrevista y desea más información, por favor envie un mensaje a David Glisch-Sánchez por e-mail a glisch.sanchez@gmail.com

STAKEHOLDER RECRUITMENT E-MAIL

Dear [Insert Name],

My name is David Glisch-Sánchez, and I am a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Sociology at the University of Texas at Austin. I am in the process of doing a research project entitled "'Listen to what your *jotería* is saying': Queer Latin@s Confronting Violence, Seeking Justice." I am reaching out and contacting individuals in community organizations or government agencies that are either concerned with issues pertaining to violence/public safety, Latina/o communities, and/or transgender, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer (TLGBQ) communities.

As a result, I am writing you because of your position as [Insert Title]/involvement as [Insert Role] with [Insert Name of Organization/Agency]. My project seeks to understand how Latina/o TLGBQ people experience social harm and violence during the late 20th and early 21st centuries. This is accomplished in large part through the collection of life history interviews with TLGBQ-identified Latin@s. However, a critical part of my project is to understand the social environment of TLGBQ Latin@s, a major component of this then is to talk with the kinds of community organizations and government agencies that address the particular issues or work on behalf of certain communities. This is a vital element of the research because it will help me identify what similarities and differences exist between the TLGBQ Latin@s I interview and important members of their social environment. Having this information will allow me to make the most informed recommendations for possible new policies, programs, or interventions to better address violence that affects Latin@ TLGBQ people.

In short, I am writing to ask whether you would be willing to sit for a short digitally recorded interview, approximately one (1) hour in length, that answers questions regarding your opinion around issues pertaining to violence and hate crimes and discuss your work in/at [Insert Name or Organization/Agency]. The interview will take place at a location of your choosing, the only requirement is that there be little background noise. This project has been approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at UT-Austin and has been assigned the IRB study number 2010-03-0153. If you have questions about the status of this project you can contact the IRB office by phone at (512) 471-8871 or by e-mail at orsc@uts.cc.utexas.edu.

If you would like more information or need specific questions answered before you can agree to the interview, or would like to start scheduling a time to be interviewed please feel free to e-mail me at glisch.sanchez@gmail.com or call me at (512) XXX-XXXX.

Sincerely,

David Glisch-Sánchez, MPP
Ph.D. Candidate
Dept. of Sociology
University of Texas at Austin

Appendix D: Life Story Participant Informed Consent Script

English Version

You are being asked to participate in a research study. In just a minute I am going to describe in more detail this project, what participants are being asked to do, your rights as an informant regarding participation, confidentiality and privacy. You will have the opportunity to ask and I will answer any questions you have about the study. After I have sufficiently answered your questions, I will then ask you if you want to begin the interview, which will signal your consent to being in the study. I would like to stress that your participation is entirely voluntary. You can refuse to participate without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You can stop your participation at any time and your refusal will not impact current or future relationships with UT Austin or any participating sites. Your decision to not participate in the study or stop the interview at any point will not offend or hurt me in any way. You are empowered to have complete control over your decision to participate or not participate at any point in our conversation. If you ever wish to not continue the interview, simply tell me that you wish to stop participation and we will stop immediately.

The purpose of this research project is to better understand the experiences of Latina and Latino transgender, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer people who encounter harm/violence because of who they are. The study seeks to understand what harm/violence people have encountered throughout their life, when and why they have felt safer or affirmed, and their opinions about harm/violence in society. Finally, this project seeks to understand not only individual experiences, but documents the multiple and complex ways harm, violence, safety, and affirmation shape Latina and Latino transgender, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer lives.

Do you have any questions at this time?

If you agree to be in this study, I will be asking you to do the following: 1) participate in a one-time audio-recorded interview about your experience with violence and related issues; and 2) give me permission to use in a confidential manner what you say and do in your interview and drawing activity in publications such as journal articles, a dissertation, and book. What I mean by this is that I will not use your real name but a pseudonym (or a fake name) in these publications.

The total estimated time to participate in this study is approximately 2.5 hours. This is the estimated length of time the interview should take. If we run out of time to finish our conversation, we might reschedule with your permission a later time to finish it.

There are minimal to no risks associated with participating in this study. Due to the sensitive topics and issues we will discuss, at times during the interview it may be

challenging to talk about and describe various parts of your experience. If that ever is the case we can either pause for a moment, move on from the question or topic, or stop the interview altogether. Remember, you are not required to talk about anything that you do not want to talk about, whether this is because you do not know the answer or it is too difficult to discuss. In addition, I will not be asking any person what their legal immigration status is; however, if a person discloses their legal status during the interview I will not report them to representatives of Immigration & Customs Enforcement (I.C.E.).

Do you have any questions about what I have said thus far?

There are several benefits of being in this study. First, by sharing and contributing your unique story and experience to this project you are helping create some of the very first research about transgender, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer Latinas and Latinos and their experiences with harm, violence, safety, and affirmation. Secondly, the results of this research will be shared with appropriate community organizations and elected officials in the effort to create and develop laws, procedures, and programs to better prevent violence and address it in more helpful ways when it happens. Lastly, you will receive a $25 VISA gift card at the end of this session to compensate you for your time and effort.

Every participant of this study, including you, has the right to privacy and confidentiality in giving an interview. Each interview will be audio recorded on a digital recorder and later transcribed. The audio recordings will be saved for a period of three (3) years after all interviewing has ended, which is required by the policies of my institution, the University of Texas at Austin. After this period, all audio recordings will be erased and destroyed. All participants will be assigned an ID number and pseudonym that will appear in place of your real name in any transcript of the interview, file of this project, or publication. Nowhere will your real name or any information that could identify you be made public. The records of this study will be stored securely and kept confidential. Only my supervising director Dr. Sharmila Rudrappa, members of the Institutional Review Board at the University of Texas at Austin and myself have the legal right to review your research records. We will protect the confidentiality of those records to the extent permitted by the law. Throughout the study, I will notify you of any new information that may become available and that might affect your decision to remain in the study.

Finally, you are not required to sign a document showing your consent to participate. Rather, by beginning the interview you are verbally signaling your consent to participate in this study. I would like to clarify again that even though you might agree to participate by beginning the interview that does not prevent you from stopping the interview later on if you desire.

Do you have any questions now about any of the information I have provided?

If you have questions later, want additional information, or wish to withdraw your participation you can contact me by e-mail. My contact information is on this sheet of paper.

In addition, if you would like to obtain more information about the research study, please contact the IRB Office at (512) 471-8871. These phone numbers and other contact information for the IRB Office can be found on the sheet of paper I have given you.

Versión Español (Spanish Version)

Le estoy invitando a participar en un estudio de investigación. En un minuto le daré los detalles de esta investigación, describiré lo que es necesario para ser participante en este proyecto, y explicaré sus derechos en cuanto a su participación, confidencialidad, y privacidad. Tendrá la oportunidad de preguntar cualquier cosa sobre el proyecto, y prometo contestarle de manera sincera. Después de contestar sus preguntas, le pediré si desea comenzar la entrevista. El comienzo de la entrevista señala que ya ha dado su consentimiento a participar en esta investigación. La participación en esta investigación es totalmente y completamente voluntaria. Está libre de negarse a participar, y de ser así no influirá su relación actual ni en el futuro con la Universidad de Texas en Austin, ni su relación con otra agencia. Su decisión de no participar en la investigacíon o de terminar la entrevista el algun momento tampoco lastimará mis sentimientos. Tiene control completo en cuanto a la decisión de participar o terminar la participación en cualquier momento durante nuestra conversación. Si quisiera terminar la entrevista, dígame y la paramos inmediatamente.

El propósito de esta investigación es entender mejor las experiencias de las latinas y los latinos que son transgénero, lesbiana, gay, o bisexual y que han experimentado violencia simplemente por ser quienes son. La investigación quiere documentar los tipos de daño/violencia que las personas han experimentado durante toda la vida, cuando y porque han sentido más seguro ó afirmado, y sus opiniones sobre el daño y la violencia que hay en la sociedad. Finalmente, este proyecto quiere entender mejor no solamente las experiencias individuales, sino también documentar las maneras varias y complicadas en que la violencia, el daño, la seguridad, y la afirmación da forma a las vidas de las latinas y los latinos que son transgénero, lesbiana, gay, y bisexual.

¿Tiene alguna pregunta en este momento?

Si está de acuerdo en participar en la investigación, le pediré que haga lo siguiente: 1) participar en una entrevista que será grabada y donde hablaremos sobre sus experiencias en cuanto a la violencia y temas relacionados; y 2) me dará su autorización para usar de manera confidencial la información que compartirá en la entrevista y actividad de dibujo, por ejemplo, en publicaciones como artículos en revistas académicas, en mi tesis doctoral, y en un libro. Quiero decirle que no voy a usar su nombre real, usaré un seudónimo o nombre falso en estas publicaciones.

El tiempo estimado de la entrevista son dos horas y media aproximadamente. Si no tenemos suficiente tiempo para terminar la entrevista, le pediré su permiso para programar otra cita y continuar con nuestra conversación.

Existe poco o ningún riesgo en la participación en este proyecto. Debido a que los temas que discutiremos son sensibles, es posible que fuere difícil discutir y describir las experiencias en cuanto a la violencia. Si eso sucede podemos parar la entrevista por un momento, discutir otra pregunta, o terminar la entrevista en su totalidad. Recuerde que no tiene que hablar de cosas que no quiera discutir, ya sea porque no sabe la repuesta o es un tema demasiado difícil. Además, no voy a preguntarle a sobre su estado legal en el país; sin embargo, si alguien revela su estatus migratorio yo no lo reportaré a ningún representante del Servicio de Inmigración y Control de Aduanas.

¿Tiene preguntas sobre lo que he compartido con usted?

Hay ciertos beneficios al participar en esta investigación. Primero, al compartir y compartir su historia y experiencia personal está ayudando a crear uno de los primeros estudios sobre daño, violencia, seguridad, y afirmación en las vidas de las latinas y los latinos transgénero, lesbiana, gay, y bisexual. Segundo, los resultados de esta investigación serán compartidos con las organizaciones comunitarias y representantes públicos apropiados a fin de avanzar a nivel legal, político, y en cuanto a procedimientos y programas para prevenir y atender mejor a las personas transgénero, lesbiana, gay, y bisexual cuando ocurra esta forma de violencia. Finalmente, recibirá Ud. una VISA tarjeta de regalo que vale $25.00 al final de nuestro sesión para compensarse por su tiempo y esfuerzo.

Cada participante de esta investigación, incluyendo a usted, tiene el derecho de ofrecer una entrevista confidencial y en privado. Cada entrevista será grabada con una grabadora digital y luego yo la transcribiré. Las grabaciones serán guardadas por 3 años a partir de cuando yo haya terminado de entrevistar a mis participantes. El período de 3 años es de acuerdo con las reglas requeridas de mi institución, la Universidad de Texas en Austin. Después de este período de tiempo, todas de las grabaciones serán destruidas. Yo le asignaré a todos mis participantes un número de identificación y un seudónimo que usaré en vez del nombre real en cualquier transcripción, ficha, o publicación de este proyecto. Yo nunca usaré en público su nombre real ni información que pueda identificarle. Todas las fichas, transcripciones y los documentos de esta investigación siempre serán guardados y conservados en estricta confidencialidad. Solamente mi supervisora, la Dra. Sharmila Rudrappa, los miembros de la Institutional Review Board de la Universidad de Texas en Austin, y yo tenemos el derecho a repasar las fichas y los documentos del proyecto y siempre protegeremos la confidencialidad de estos documentos hasta el punto permitido por la ley. Durante el estudio, yo le comunicaré si acaso hay nueva información que pueda cambiar su decisión a permanecer como participante de la investigación.

Finalmente, no se requiere de firmar ningún documento para dar su consentimiento a participar en la entrevista y en la investigación. En vez de dar su firma, cuando empiece la entrevista, usted estará indicando de manera verbal que da su consentimiento a participar en esta investigación. Quiero reafirmar y recordarle que aunque pueda estar de acuerdo con participar al principio de la entrevista, eso no previene que luego pueda decidir en terminar la entrevista.

¿Tiene preguntas sobre la información que yo he compartido con usted?

Si tiene preguntas más tarde, o desea más información, o desea dejar de participar en la investigación, puede contactarme por e-mail o teléfono. La información para contactarme está en la tarjeta que le dí. También, si tiene preguntas sobre sus derechos como un participante de esta investigación, por favor, llame la oficina del Institutional Review Board, su número es (512) 471-8871. Éste número de teléfono y otra información de contacto de la Institutional Review Board de la Universidad de Texas en Austin están en el papelito que le dí junto con la tarjeta que tiene mi información.

Bibliography

Acosta, Katie L. 2013. *Amigas y Amantes: Sexually Nonconforming Latinas Negotiate Family*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Alba, Richard D., John R. Logan & Brian J. Stults. 2000. "The Changing Neighborhood Contexts of the Immigrant Metropolis," *Social Forces*, 79(2), p. 587-621.

Alexander, Michelle. 2010. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. New York: The New Press.

Almaguer, Tomás. 1991. "Chicano Men: A Cartography of Homosexual Identity and Behavior." *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, 3(2), p. 75-100.

Anderson, Nels. 1923. *The Hobo*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. 1987. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.

Anzaldúa, Gloria E. 2002. "Preface." P. 1-5 in *This Bridge We Call Home: Radical Visions for Transformation*, ed. by G. E. Anzaldúa & A. Keating. New York: Routledge.

Arce, Carlos, Edward Murguia & W. Parker Frisbie. 1987. "Phenotype and Life Chances Among Chicanos," *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 9(1), p. 19-32.

Argüellos, Lourdes and Anne M. Rivero. 1993. "Gender/Sexual Orientation Violence and Transnational Migration: Conversations With Some Latinas We Think We Know." *Urban Anthropology*, 22(3-4), p. 259-275.

Asencio, Marysol, ed. 2010. *Latina/o Sexualities: Probing Powers, Passions, Practices, and Policies*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Ayala, George. 2010. "Retiring Behavioral Risk, Disease, and Deficit Models: Sexual Health Frameworks for Latino Gay Men and Other Men Who Enjoy Sex with Men." P. 274-278 in *Latina/o Sexualities: Probing Powers, Passions, Practices, and Policies* ed. by M. Asencio. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Babbie, Earl. 2004. *The Practice of Social Research*. 10th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Becker, Howard S. 1970. *Sociological Work: Method and Substance*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishers.

Beeman, Angie K. 2007. "Emotional Segregation: A Content Analysis of Institutional Racism in U.S. Film, 1980-2001," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(5), p. 687-712.

Bendelow, Gillian & Simon J. Williams. 1995. "Transcending the Dualisms: Towards a Sociology of Pain," *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 17(2), p. 139-165.

_____. 1998. "Emotions, Pain, and Gender." P. 249-263 in *Emotions in Social Life: Critical Themes and Contemporary Issues*. London: Routledge.

Bennett, Susie, James J. Nolan & Norman Conti. 2009. "Defining and Measuring Hate Crime: A Potpourri of Issues". P.163-182 in *Hate Crimes: Volume 1: Understanding and Defining Hate Crime*, ed. by B. Perry and B. Levin. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Bertrand, Marrianne & Sendhil Mullainathan. 2004. "Are Emily and Greg More Employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A Field Experiment on Labor Market Discrimination," *American Economic Review*, 94(4), p. 991-1013.

Biblarz, Timothy J. and Evren Savci. 2010. "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Families," *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(3), p. 480-497.

Blumer, Herbert. 1969. *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bogdan, Robert. 1974. *Being Different: The Autobiography of Jane Fry*. New York: Wiley Publishers.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2001. *White Supremacy and Racism in the Post-Civil Rights Era*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Reinner Publishers.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2006. *Racism Without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Translated by R. Nice. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Loïc J. D. Wacquant, Eds. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Brunson, Rod K. and Jody Miller. 2006. "Young Black Men and Urban Policing in the United States," *British Journal of Criminology*, 46(4), p. 613-640.

Burton, Linda M., Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, Victor Ray, Rose Buckelew & Elizabeth Hordge Freeman. 2010. "Critical Race Theories, Colorism, and the Decade's Research on Families of Color," *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(3), p. 440-459.

Cahill, Spencer E. 1995. "Embarrassability and Public Civility: Another View of a Much Maligned Emotion," P. 253-271 in *Social Perspectives on Emotion*, ed. by M. Flaherty & C. Ellis. Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Calvo, Luz and Catrióna Rueda Esquibel. 2010. "Latina Lesbianas, BiMujeres, and Trans Identities: Charting Courses in the Social Sciences." P. 217-229 in *Latina/o Sexualities: Probing Powers, Passions, Practices, and Policies* ed. by M. Asencio. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Cantú, Jr., Lionel. 2009. *The Sexuality of Migration: Border Crossings and Mexican Immigrant Men*. Ed. by N. A. Naples & S. Vidal-Ortiz. New York: New York University Press.

Chambliss, William J. 1972. *Boxman: A Professional Thief*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Charmaz, Kathy. 2006. *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Clark, Candace. 1990. "Emotions and Micropolitics in Everyday Life: Some Patterns and Paradoxes of 'Place'." P. 305-333 in *Research Agendas in the Sociology of Emotions*, ed. by T. D. Kemper. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Cohen, Cathy. 2012. "Youth Politics and Social Change." Conference paper at *A New Vision of Black Freedom: The Manning Marable Memorial Conference*. New York: Columbia University.

Collins, Randall. 1993. "Emotional Energy as the Common Denominator of Rational Action," *Rationality and Society*, 5, p. 203-230.

Combahee River Collective. 1983. "A Black Feminist Statement." P. 210-218 in *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*, ed. by C. Moraga & G. Anzaldúa. New York: Kitchen Table, Women of Color Press.

Connell, R. W. 1990. "The State, Gender, and Sexual Politics: Theory and Appraisal." *Theory and Society* 19(5): 507-544.

Connell, R. W. and James W. Messerschmidt. 2005. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender & Society*, 19(6), p. 829-859.

Cornwell, Chic and Edwin H. Sutherland. 1937. *The Professional Thief*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Coyle, Michael J. 2003. "Latinos and the Texas Criminal Justice System," *NCLR Statistical Brief*, No. 2. Washington, D.C.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1991. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color," *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), p. 1241-1299.

Crouch, Ben M. & James R. Marquart. 1989. *An Appeal to Justice: Litigated Reform of Texas Prisons*. Austin, TX: The University of Texas Press.

Cruz-Janzen, Marta I. 2010. "Latinegras: Desired Women—Undesirable Mothers, Daughters, Sisters, and Wives." P. 282-295 in *The Afro-Latin@ Reader: History and Culture in the United States*, ed. by M. Jiménez Román and Juan Flores.

Decena, Carlos Ulises. 2011. *Tacit Subjects: Belonging and Same-Sex Desire Among Dominican Immigrant Men*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

DeFreitas, Gregory. 1988. "Hispanic Immigration & Labor Market Segmentation." *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 27(2), p. 195-214.

Denzin, Norman K. 1984. *On Understanding Emotion*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dollard, John. 1949. *Criteria for the Life History*. Magnolia, MA: Peter Smith Publishing.

Drake, St. Clair and Horace R. Cayton. 1945. *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

DuBois. W. E. B. 1994[1903]. *The Souls of Black Folk*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, Inc.

Egan, Patrick J., Murray S. Edelman & Kenneth Sherrill. 2008. *Findings from the Hunter College Poll of Lesbians, Gays, and Bisexuals: New Discoveries About Identity, Political Attitudes, and Civic Engagement*. City University of New York: Hunter College.

Espino, Rodolfo and Michael Franz. 2002. "Latino Phenotypic Discrimination Revisited: The Impact of Skin Color on Occupational Status," *Social Science Quarterly*, 83(2), p. 612-623.

Feagin, Joe R. 2001. *Racist America: Roots, Current Realities, & Future Reparations*. New York: Routledge

Feagin, Joe R. 2009. *The White Racial Frame: Centuries of Racial Framing and Counter-Framing*. New York: Routledge.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. 1999. *Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines: Uniform Crime Reporting*. Washington, D.C.: Criminal Justice Information Services Division, FBI.

Fields, Jessica, Martha Copp & Sherryl Kleinman. 2007. "Symbolic Interactionism, Inequality, and Emotions." P. 155-178 in *Handbook of the Sociology of Emotions*, ed. by J. E. Stets & J. H. Turner. New York: Springer.

Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Ed. by C. Gordon. Translated by C. Gordon, L. Marshall, J. Mepham & K. Soper. New York: The Harvester Press

Foucault, Michel. 1982. "The Subject and Power." *Critical Inquiry* 8(4): 777-795.

Francis, Linda E. 2007. "Emotions and Health." P. 591-610 in *Handbook of the Sociology of Emotions*, ed. by J. E. Stets & J. H. Turner. New York: Springer.

Franks, David D. 2003. "Emotions." P. 787-809 in *Handbook of Symbolic Interactionism*, ed. by L. T. Reynolds & N. J. Herman-Kinney. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Franks, David D. and Thomas S. Smith. 1999. "Some Convergences and Divergences between Neuroscience and Symbolic Interaction." P. 157-182 in *Mind, Brain, and Society: Toward a Neurosociology of Emotion. Social Perspectives on Emotion* ed. by D. D. Franks and T. S. Smith. Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Frazier, E. Franklin. 1949. *The Negro in the United States*. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Garcia, Lorena. 2012. *Respect Yourself, Protect Yourself: Latina Girls and Sexual Identity*. New York: New York University Press.

General Accounting Office. 2004. *High-Performing Organizations: Metrics, Means, and Mechanisms for Achieving High Performance in the 21st Century Public Management Environment*. Washington, D.C.

Glaser, Barney G. 1978. Theoretical Sensitivity: Advances in the Methodology of Grounded Theory. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, Barney G. and Anselm L. Strauss. 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Glazer, Nathan. 1975. *Affirmative Discrimination: Ethnic Inequality and Public Policy*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

_____. 1983. *Ethnic Dilemmas, 1964-1982*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Glisch-Sanchez, David. 2014. "From 'Hate Crimes' to Social Harm: Critical Moments and Reflexive Practice." P. 127-137 in *Reflexivity in Criminological Research: Experiences with the Powerless and the Powerful*, ed. by K. Lumsden & A. Winter. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Goffman, Erving. 1967. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

Goldberg, David Theo. 2002. *The Racial State*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.

González-López, Gloria. 2005. *Erotic Journeys: Mexican Immigrants and Their Sex Lives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

_____. 2006. "Heterosexual Fronteras: Immigrant mexicanos, sexual vulnerabilities, and survival." *Sexuality Research & Social Policy* 3(3), p. 67-81.

Goodson, Ivor. 1980-81. "Life Histories and the Study of Schooling." *Interchange*, 2(4):62-76.

Gordon, Avery F. 1997. *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Gordon, Steven L. 1981. "The Sociology of Sentiments and Emotions." P. 562-592 in *Social Psychology: Sociological Perspectives*, ed. by M. Rosenberg & R. H. Turner. New York: Basic Books.

Gorman-Murray, Andrew. 2008. "Queering The Family Home: Narratives from gay, lesbian, and bisexual youth coming out in supportive family homes in Australia," *Gender, Place, and Culture*, 15(1), p. 31-44.

Gugelberger, Georg & Michael Kearney. 1991. "Voices for the Voiceless: Testimonial Literature in Latin America". *Latin American Perspectives*, 18(3), p. 3-14.

Guidotti-Hernández, Nicole M. 2011. *Unspeakable Violence: Remapping U.S. and Mexican National Imaginaries*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Guzmán, Monolo. 2006. *Gay Hegemony/Latino Homosexualities*. New York: Routledge.

Hall, Nathan. 2005. *Hate Crime*. In *Crime and Society Series*. Portland, OR: Willan Publishing.

Hakken, Jon. 1979. *Discrimination Against Chicanos in the Dallas Rental Housing Market: An Experimental Extension of the Housing Practices Survey*. Washington, D.C.: Dept. of Housing and Urban Development.

Hartman, Saidiya V. 1997. *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth Century America*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Heatherington, Laurie and Justin Lavner. 2008. ""Coming to Terms with Coming Out: Review and Recommendations for Family Systems-Focused Research," *Journal of Family Psychology*, 22(3), p. 329-343.

Henry, Jessica S. 2009. "Hate Crime Laws: A Critical Perspective". P. 183-203 in *Hate Crimes: Volume 1: Understanding and Defining Hate Crime*, ed. by B. Perry and B. Levin. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Herek, Gregory M. 1992. "The Social Context of Hate Crimes: Notes on Cultural Heterosexism." P. 89-104 in *Hate Crimes: Confronting Violence Against Lesbians and Gay Men*, ed. by G. M. Herek and K. T. Berrill. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.

Hill Collins, Patricia. 1998. *Fighting Words: Black Women and the Search for Justice*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Hill Collins, Patricia. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

Hillyard, Paddy & Steven Tombs. 2004. "Beyond Criminology?" P. 10-29 in *Beyond Criminology: Taking Harm Seriously*, ed. by P. Hillyard, C. Pantanzis, S. Tombs & D. Gordon. Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press.

Hillyard, Paddy, Christina Pantanzis, Steve Tombs & Dave Gordon. 2004. "Introduction." P. 1-9 in *Beyond Criminology: Taking Harm Seriously*, ed. by P. Hillyard, C. Pantanzis, S. Tombs & D. Gordon. Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1990. "Ideology and Emotion Management: A Perspective and Path for Future Research." P. 117-142 in *Research Agendas in the Sociology of Emotions*, ed. by T. D. Kemper. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1998. "The Sociology of Emotion as a Way of Seeing." P. 3-15 in *Emotions in Social Life: Critical Themes and Contemporary Issues*, ed. by G. Bendelow & S. J. Williams. New York: Routledge.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 2012[1983]. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley: CA: University of California Press.

Holmes, Malcolm D. 2000. "Minority Threat and Police Brutality: Determinants of Civil Rights Criminal Complaints in U.S. Municipalities," *Criminology*, 38(2), p. 343-368.

Hunt, Alan and Gary Wickham. 1994. *Foucault and Law: Towards a Sociology of Law as Governance*. London: Pluto Press.

Hunter, Ernst. 2008. "What Good for the Gays is Good for the Gander: Making Homeless Youth Housing Safer for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Youth," *Family Court Review*, 46(3), p. 329-343.

Hunter. Margaret L. 2002. "'If Your Light You're Alright': Light Sking Color as Social Capital for Women of Color," *Gender & Society*, 16(2), p. 175-193.

Iganski, Paul. 2008. *'Hate Crime' and the City*. Bristol, UK: The Policy Press.

INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence. 2009. *Color of Violence: The INCITE! Anthology*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Jacobs, David and Robert M. O'Brien. 1998. "A Structural Analysis of Police Violence," *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(4), p. 837-862.

Jagose, Annmarie. 1996. *Queer Theory: An Introduction*. New York: New York University Press.

Kann, Mark E. 1999. *The Gendering of American Politics: Founding Mothers, Founding Fathers, and Political Patriarchy*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger Publishers.

Kemper, Theodore D. 1978a. *A Social Interactional Theory of Emotions*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Kemper, Theodore D. 1978b. "Toward a Sociology of Emotions: Some Problems and Some Solutions." *The American Sociologist*, 13, p. 30-41.

Klockars, Carl B. 1975. *The Professional Fence*. London: Tavistock Publishers.

Korpi, Walter and Joakim Palme. 1998. "The Paradox of Redistribution and Strategies of Equality: Welfare State Institutions, Inequality, and Poverty in the Western Countries." *American Sociological Review* 63: 661-687.

Krogstad, Jens Manuel. 2014. "Top issue for Hispanics? Hint: It's not immigration" Pew Research Center: Hispanic Trends Project.

Lahey, Joanna. 2005. "Age, Women, and Hiring: An Experimental Study," NBER Working Paper #11435. Boston, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Latina Feminist Group, The. 2001. *Telling to Live: Latina Feminist Testimonios*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Laub, Dori. 1992. "An Event Without A Witness: Truth, Testimony, and Survival." P. 75-92 in *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History*, ed. by S. Felman & D. Laub. New York: Routledge.

Lewis, Oscar. 1959. *Five Families: Mexican Case Studies in the Culture of Poverty*. New York: Wiley.

_____. 1961. *The Children of Sanchez: Autobiography of a Mexican Family*. New York: Vintage Books.

_____. 1966. *La Vida: A Puerto Rican Family in the Culture of Poverty—San Juan and New York*. New York: Random House.

Lister, Ruth. 2003. *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*. 2nd ed. New York: New York University Press.

Luthar, Suniya S. & Karen D'Avanzo. 1999. "Contextual Factors in Substance Use: A Study of Suburban and Inner-City Adolescents," *Development and Psychopathology*, 11(4), p. 845-867.

Martin, Steve J. and Sheldon Ekland-Olson. 1987. *Texas Prisons: The Walls Came Tumbling Down*. Austin, Texas: Texas Monthly Press.

Massey, Douglas S. 2002. "A Brief History of Human Society: The Origin and Role of Emotion in Social Life: 2001 Presidential Address," *American Sociological Review*, 67(1), p. 1-29.

Massey, Douglas S. and Garvey Lundy. 2001. "Use of Black English and Racial Discrimination in Urban Housing Markets: New Methods and Findings," *Urban Affairs Review*, 36, p. 452-469.

Matiss, Ilze Arielle. 2001. "Moments in Time." P. 223-229 in *Lives in Context: The Art of Life History Research*, edited by A. L. Cole and J. G. Knowles. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

McBride, Dwight. 2005. *Why I Hate Abercrombie & Fitch: Essays on Race and Sexuality in America*. New York: New York University Press.

McLafferty, Sara & Valerie Preston. 1992. "Spatial Mismatch and Labor Market Segmentation for African-American and Latina Women." *Economic Geography*, 68(4), p. 406-431.

Mead, Lawrence M. 1986. *Beyond Entitlement: The Social Obligations of Citizenship*. New York: Free Press.

_____. 1993. *The New Politics of Poverty: The Nonworking Poor in America*. New York: Basic Books.

Menjívar, Cecilia and Néstor Rodríguez, eds. 2005. *When States Kill: Latin America, the U.S., and Technologies of Terror*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Mills, C. Wright. 1956. *The Power Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mirchandani, Kiran. 2003. "Challenging Racial Silences in Studies of Emotion Work: Contributions from Anti-Racist Feminist Theory," *Organization Studies*, 24(5), p. 721-742.

Montejano, David. 1987. *Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas, 1836-1986*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Moore, Mignon R. 2008. "Gendered Power Relations Among Women: A Study of Household Decision Making in Black, Lesbian Stepfamilies," *American Sociological Review*, 73(2), p. 335-356.

Morris, David B. 1991. *The Culture of Pain*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Morrow, Deana F. 2004. "Social Work Practice with Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Adolescents," *Families in Society*, 85(1), p. 91-99.

Moynihan, Patrick. 1965. *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.

Murguia, Edward and Edward Telles. 1996. "Phenotype and Schooling Among Mexican Americans," *Sociology of Education*, 69(4), p. 276-289.

Nagata, Donna K. & Wendy J. Y. Cheng. 2003. "Intergenerational communication of race-related trauma by Japanese American former internees," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 73(3), p. 266-278.

Ochoa, Marcia. 2010. " Latina/o Transpopulations." P. 230-242 in *Latina/o Sexualities: Probing Powers, Passions, Practices, and Policies* ed. by M. Asencio. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Ojermark, Annica. 2007. "Presenting Life Histories: A Literature Review and Annotated Bibliography." Working Paper 101, Chronic Poverty Research Centre.

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 1994. *Racial Formations in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

Orloff, Ann. 1996. "Gender in the Welfare State." *Annual Review of Sociology* 22: 51-78.

Pager, Devah. 2003. "The Mark of a Criminal Record," *American Journal of Sociology*, 108(5), p. 937-975.

Pager, Devah, Bart Bonikowski, and Bruce Western. 2009. "Discrimination in a Low-Wage Labor Market: A Field Experiment," *American Sociological Review*, 74(5), p. 777-799.

Pascoe, C. J. 2007. *Dude You're a Fag: Masculinity and Sexuality in High School*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Peña, Susana. 2013. *¡Oye Loca! From the Mariel Boatlift to Gay Cuban Miami*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Perry, Barbara. 2001. *In the Name of Hate: Understanding Hate Crimes*. New York: Routledge.

Perry, Barbara. 2005. "A Crime by Any Other Name: The Semantics of 'Hate'," *Journal of Hate Studies*, 4, p. 121-137.

Peters, Marie Ferguson. 2002. "Racial Socialization of Young Black Children" P. 57-72 in *Black Children: Social, Educational, and Parental Environments*, 2nd Ed., ed. by H. P. McAdoo. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Plummer, Ken. 1983. *Documents of Life*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Presser, Lois. 2013. *Why We Harm*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Riach, P. A. and J. Rich. 2002. "Field Experiments of Discrimination in the Market Place," *Economic Journal*, 112, F480-F518.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. and Chris Bourg. 2004. "Gender as Status: An Expectation States Theory Approach." P. 217-241 in *The Psychology of Gender*, ed. by A. H. Eagly, A. E. Beall & R. J. Sternberg. New York: Guilford.

Ritchie, Beth. 1996. *Compelled to Crime: The Gender Entrapment of Black Battered Women*. New York: Routledge.

Russell, Jame A. 1980. "A Circumplex Model of Affect," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, p. 1161-1178.

Scott, James C. 1990. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Scheff, Thomas J. 1988. "Shame and Conformity: The Deference-Emotion System." *American Sociological Review*, 53, p. 395-406.

Scheff, Thomas J. 1990. "Socialization of Emotion: Pride and Shame as Causal Agents." P. 281-304 in *Research Agendas in the Sociology of Emotions*, ed. by T. D. Kemper. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Segura, Denise. 1984. "Labor Market Stratification: The Chicana Experience." *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 29, p. 57-91.

Shaw, Clifford R. 1930. *The Jack-Roller: A Delinquent Boy's Own Story*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Shields, Stephanie A. 1995. "The Role of Emotion Beliefs and Values in Gender Development." P. 212-232 in *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, ed. by N. Eisenberg. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Shields, Stephanie A. 2002. *Speaking from the Heart: Gender and the Social Meaning of Emotion*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Smart, Barry. 2002. *Michel Foucault: Revised Edition*. In Key Sociologists Series ed. by P. Hamilton. New York: Routledge.

Smith-Lovin, Lynn. 1990. "Emotion as the Confirmation and Disconfirmation of Identity: An Affect Control Model." P. 238-270 in *Research Agendas in the Sociology of Emotions*, ed. by T. D. Kemper. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Steele, Shelby. 1990. The *Content of Our Character: A New Vision for Race in America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Stets. Jan E. 2004. "Emotions in Identity Theory: The Effects of Status." *Advances in Group Processes*, 21, p. 51-76.

Stewart, Eric A., Ramiro Martinez, Eric P. Baumer, and Marc Gertz. 2015. "The Social Context of Latino Threat and Punitive Latino Sentiment," *Social Problems*, 62(1), p. 78-103.

Strauss, Anselm L. and Juliet Corbin. 1990. *Basics of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Telles, Edward and Edward Murguia. 1990. "Phenotypic Discrimination and Income Differences Among Mexican Americans," *Social Science Quarterly*, 71(4), p. 682-696.

Telles, Edward E. and Vilma Ortiz. 2008. *Generations of Exclusion: Mexican Americans, Assimilation, and Race*. New York: Russell Safe Foundation.

Texas Education Agency. 2012. *Texas Education Agency Strategic Plan for the Fiscal Years 2013-2017*. Austin, TX

Texas Department of Criminal Justice. 2014. *Report on Customer Service*. Austin, TX.

Thamm, Robert A. 2007. "The Classification of Emotions." P. 11-37 in *Handbook of the Sociology of Emotions*, ed. by J. E. Stets & J. H. Turner. New York: Springer.

Thernstrom, Stephan & Abigail Thernstrom. 1997. *America in Black and White: One Nation, Indivisible*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Thomas, William I., and Florian Znaniecki. 1918-1920. *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*. 2nd ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Thrasher, Frederic. 1927. *The Gang: A study of 1313 Gangs in Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Trujillo, Carla. 1991. "Chicana Lesbians: Fear and Loathing in the Chicano Community." P. 186-194 in *Chicana Lesbians: The Girls Our Mothers Warned Us About* ed. by C. Trujillo. Berkeley, CA: Third Woman Press.

Turner, Jonathan H. 1999. "Toward a General Sociological Theory of Emotions," *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*, 29, p. 132-162.

Turner, Jonathan H. 2002. *Face-to-Face: Towards a Sociological Theory of Interpersonal Behavior*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Walby, Sylvia. 1989. "Theorising Patriarchy." *Sociology* 23(2): 213-234.

Wallace, Ruth A. and Alison Wolf. 2006. *Contemporary Sociological Theory: Expanding the Classical Tradition*. 6th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.

Ward, Tony. 2004. "State harms." P. 84-100 in *Beyond Criminology: Taking Harm Seriously*, ed. by P. Hillyard, C. Pantazis, S. Tombs & D. Gordon. Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press.

Weber, Max. 1919. *Politics as a Vocation*. Islamabad, Pakistan: Friedrich-Naumann-Stiftung für die Freiheit. (E-book accessed on iBooks).

Weiner, Bernard. 1980. "The Role of Affect in Rational Attributional Approaches to Human Motivation," *Educational Researcher*, 97, p. 4-11.

Wells-Barnett, Ida B. 1895. *The Red Record: Tabulated Statistics and Alleged Causes of Lynching in the United States*. Chicago, IL: Donohue and Henneberry.

West, Candace & Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender," *Gender and Society*, 1, p. 125-151.

Wienk, Ronald E., Clifford E. Reid, John C. Simonson, and Frederick J. Eggers. 1979. *Measuring Discrimination in American Housing Markets: The Housing Markets Practices Survey*. Washington, D.C.: Dept. of Housing and Urban Development.

Wilkins, Amy C. & Jennifer A. Pace. 2014. "Class, Race, and Emotions." P. 385-409 in *Handbook of the Sociology of Emotions, Volume II*, ed. by J. E. Stets & J. H. Turner. New York: Springer.

Wilson, William Julius. 1978. *The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Changing American Institutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

_____. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Wirth, Louis. 1928. *The Ghetto*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wright, Erik Olin. 1979. *Class, Crisis, and the State*. New York: New Left Books.

Wright, Eric R. & Brea L. Perry. 2006. "Sexual Identity Distress, Social Support, and the Health of Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Youth," *Journal of Homosexuality*, 51(1), 81-110.

Yinger, John. 1995. *Closed Doors, Opportunities Lost*. New York: Russell Safe Foundation.

Yúdice, George. 1991. "Testimonio and Postmodernism." *Latin American Perspectives*, 18(3), p. 15-31.

Zorbaugh, Harvey Warren. 1929. *The Gold Coast and the Slum: A Sociological Study of Chicago's Near North Side*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

---

[1] The application of labels and terms to describe an individual's and/or group's sexual and gender identities is almost always a precarious endeavor. In this proposal I use the terms TLGBQ and queer interchangeably to refer to the specific kinds of non-normative gender and sexual identities that are located within the purview of this study. Of interest are those individuals who do not identify as both heterosexual *and* cisgender; meaning participants would describe either or both of their gender and sexual identities as lying outside of heteropatriarchal norms. Therefore, queer and TLGBQ should be understood as analytical categories, not necessarily reflective of the specific terms individual participants would use for themselves.

[2] I use the term "Latin@," and choose to pronounce it using a diphthong (i.e. Latinao) instead of the more common Latina/Latino pronunciation. I have, decided to follow this linguistic pattern after reading Sandra K. Soto's book *Reading Chican@ Like a Queer: The De-Mastery of Desire*, where she writes "'Chican@' signals a conscientious departure from certainty, mastery, and wholeness, while still announcing a politicized collectivity…the non-alphabetic symbol for "at" disrupts our desire for intelligibility, our desire for a quick and certain visual register of a gendered body the split second we see or hear the term" (p. 2). The use of Latin@ not only disrupts gender regimes, but also dominant constructions of sexuality and ethnoracial identity. The simple addition of an "at" symbol causes us to wonder and question whether we even know what racially and ethnically constitutes a Latina or a Latino. Additionally, it allows us to re-imagine new and different sexualities not bound by gendered bodies and their associated rules.

[3] Gloria Anzaldúa (2002) further explains nepantla when she writes: "I associate *nepantla* with states of mind that question old ideas and beliefs, acquire new perspectives, change worldviews, and shift from one world to another" (p. 1).

[4] My essay, "From 'Hate Crimes' to Social Harm: Critical Moments and Reflexive Practice" (2014), details the journey and process of this project initially using a hate crime to a social harm framework.

[5] All names of interview participants are pseudonyms so as to maintain confidentiality.

[6] In transitioning from a dissertation project to a book project, my plan moving forwards is a more targeted recruitment strategy that focuses on three TLGBQ Latin@ segments: Afro-Latin@s, immigrants, and transgender men.

[7] This short life story was given by one of the 18 year old participants. In general the trend was, the older the participant the longer the life story interview, which is not surprising because they have lived longer and try to account and represent for more history.

[8] By mid-level codes, I am referring to codes that represent broad sociological themes or dynamics such as "sibling conflict" that identifies all data that references conflict between siblings. Once all the data is coded for this mid-level analysis, I will be able to drill down and code for more specific and narrow social dynamics. For example, some potential codes below the broad topic of "sibling conflict" would be "same-

gender sibling conflict" or "cross gender sibling conflict" to analyze whether there are differences between when participants are reporting conflict with a sibling of the same or different gender as themselves.
[9] I substitute "of Middle Eastern descent" in place of the specific national origin Nadia names because of concerns that the amount of specificity produced by providing that information could compromise their confidentiality.
[10] Nadia uses "cis" as a contraction of "cisgender."
[11] C. J. Pascoe observes this very phenomenon in her book *Dude You're a Fag: Masculinity and Sexuality in High School* (2007). She observes that the set of gendered practices that would make White boys and Black boys targets for, what she terms, "fag discourse" are different, sometimes completely so. The greatest example Pascoe provides is the use of dancing; she concludes that dancing for Black boys in many ways is an assertion of normative gender and sexuality, whereas dancing at all for White boys is a sign of non-normative gender and sexuality.
[12] By "narrative fact" I am referring to the factual details a participant provides about a given social harm event, like their age at the time of the harmful event, location, people involved, etc. I say "narrative" because I acknowledge that a third party does not substantiate these facts and thus I am relying on their set of recollected facts.
[13] "Narrative representation" refers to the linguistic choices a participant uses to portray their experience of an event, such as an language concerning what they were feeling at the time or later, their understanding of any consequences or long-term effects of a particular experience, etc. These linguistic choices are a function, in large part, of social dynamics and provide insights into important sociological processes relevant to interpersonal relations, group dynamics, institutional operation, etc.
[14] I mention fetishization because trans women, especially trans women of color, are overly represented as sex workers. The emphasis of trans women as sex workers is particularly egregious in news reports and media portrayals of murdered trans women. It is often speculated or implied without concrete evidence that the murder occurred during a transaction for sexual services.
[15] This is important for Anzaldúa because she identifies the Western process of objectification as the root for contemporary and historical violence (1987, p. 37).
[16] Max Weber lived through a very tumultuous period of world history, namely World War I, the Russian Revolution, the creation of the Weimar Republic. Therefore, it is not a surprise that Weber was primarily concerned with the connection between the state and the use of physical force. Even though it is understandable given the time period from which he writes, his theories have their limitation in their application towards contemporary TLGBQ Latin@ narratives of social harm.
[17] "Normativity" is different from something being "normal." Whereas "normal" refers to the regular frequency with which an action, inaction, and/or belief occurs or is expressed; "normativity" can include that which occurs with regular frequency, but more importantly refers to those actions, inactions, and beliefs that are considered desirable, correct, and the standard by which everything else is compared and evaluated.
[18] Weber does acknowledge the state is a hierarchical mechanism for a small group of people to dominate the rest. Thus, Weber, would agree that not everyone has equal probability in experiencing state social harm, but outside the relative safety of membership within the socio-political elite, all persons are at the mercy of state and its "right" to use violence.
[19] By "post-civil rights" I refer to the time period roughly from 1968 to the present. The Civil Rights Act of 1968, commonly referred to as the Fair Housing Act, was the last major piece of civil rights legislation that characterized the Black Freedom Struggle of the 1950s and 1960s. The post-civil rights period has been marked with an organized backlash to the public policy successes of the 1960s and shift of mainstream white racial ideology from that of overt white supremacy to "color-blind racism" as Bonilla-Silva (2001) terms it.
[20] The only caveat I would argue is that this is as much a function of Foucault's own choice in how to define the state as it is in any empirical observational evidence he utilizes.

[21] Although Foucault is claimed by many sexuality studies scholars as one of their own, I argue that Foucault's interest in sexuality is almost exclusively in the realm of *sexual practice* and the normative judgments associated with certain groupings of sexual practices and their regulation and disciplining. *Sexual identities* are rooted in part in sexual practices, but are the function of an infinitely more complex matrix of factors for individuals, which have been well documented amongst Latin@s (Acosta 2013, González-López 2006, Guzmán 2006, Peña 2013). This is a critical distinction to understand the limitations of Foucauldian theories.

[22] Hill Collins (2000) defines matrix of domination as a term that "describes [the] overall social organization within which intersecting oppressions originate, develop, and are contained" (p. 227-228).

[23] A perfect example of this phenomenon as I write this chapter is the regularity with which law enforcement agents murder unarmed black men. Although there was been greater awareness of these events, especially through alternative news media, the lack of response by elected officials and the general public, especially by white people, reflects how the murders of young black men by police officers is not viewed as a deviant behavior.

[24] Building off of the work by the collective INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (2009), I use the term "nongovernmental-state associated organization" (NGSAO) to identify a specific class of nonprofit organizations that are specifically created and/or designed to carry out specific function of or for the state.

[25] These offices, divisions, programs, etc. represent major administrative units of their home departments. In other words, the heads of these units report directly to the Secretary of their Department.

[26] The federalist structure of the U.S. government is meant to designate particular functions and activities as the purview of either the federal government or individual state governments. For example, tariffs, immigration, national security and foreign policy are the domains of the federal government, while criminal codes, land use ordinances, family law, and business regulations, are classic examples of state governance especially if they occur entirely within the jurisdiction of a single state (the one exception being if it occurs on federal land/property). Through the course of the 20th century federalism has been hotly contested through the gradual and sometimes dramatic expansions of federal authority through assertions of the Commerce Clause in the U.S. Constitution, assertions often upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court.

[27] I also would argue that the seeming success of the U.S. in the narrow terms of preventing similar large-scale 9/11 attacks does not justify the means by which this has been achieved. There has been considerable evidence presented in news media to suggest that other strategies could have been pursued with equal success without infringing on civil liberties and civil rights.

[28] By conservative I refer to the dominant worldview, ideological orientation of the state. I am not merely referring to partisan politics, although that is implicated given the U.S.' entrenched two-party political system. Texas' brand of conservatism has been shaped by its history as a former member of The Confederate States of America and its role in the development of the doctrine of Manifest Destiny and the U.S.' imperial western expansion.

[29] Disparate impact analysis is one of the recognized standards for substantiating discrimination claims under various federal anti-discrimination statutes. Disparate impact allows claimants to show that a specific policy, law, or regulation is discriminatory in its effect, even if there is no evidence of discrimination in intent. Thus, a policy that is racially neutral on the surface can be found in violation of the law if it is shown that one or more racial groups is treated differently in effect and harmed as a result.

[30] State jails are different from county jails.

[31] sexually transmitted infections; this includes HIV, gonorrhea, chlamydia, herpes, etc.

[32] these two murders occurred approximately a year apart, with the first occurring less than two years before the interview with Donna.

[33] Cecilia Muñoz has a long history of working in and on behalf of Latin@ communities, especially as it relates to immigration. In fact, it was her advocacy and activism on the issue of immigration that earned her a "Genius Grant" from the MacArthur Foundation. More recently, she is Assistant to the President and Director of the Domestic Policy Council for President Barack Obama. Her tenure and employment with the

White House has come under criticism of many Latin@ activists who believe she has not advocated strongly enough in her current position with regards to immigration reform.

[34] My use of queer here is meant in the political sense and not in relation to sexual identity. Queer theorists (Jagose 1996) have long identified the purpose and aim of queerness is to resist, counter, and interrogate normative practices, ideologies, and expectations that seek to discipline subjects into conforming within narrow social and political parameters that reify social hierarchies and inequalities.

[35] The bracketed ellipsis is meant to denote that a portion of the transcription presented has been withheld since the content is not relevant to the discussion at hand.

[36] I define professionals as those individuals who are in jobs and/or occupations that require advanced educational training or credentials, such as the requirement of a Bachelor's degree. Necessarily, this means that TLGBQ Latin@s in the sample who have a college education are not automatically categorized as professionals; only those in jobs or careers that require such education or training are defined as professionals for the purpose of this study.

[37] The passage I have excised from this portion of the transcript concerns a story about the time when Isidro's transgender co-worker comes to live with him and his roommate in Central Texas.

[38] Latino- or Hispanic-Serving Institutions (LSI/HIS) are colleges and universities who are not for-profit, enroll a significant economically needy population, and whose student body is 25% or more Latin@, as measured by full-time equivalent. Being designated by the U.S. Dept. of Education as an LSI/HIS allows schools to access Title III under the Higher Education Act of 1965.

[39] Blues humor is a term originally derived from the African American tradition of using humor to critique American racism. Legendary poet, Langston Hughes, described blues music as "laughter to keep from crying" Many other, if not all, oppressed groups, not just racialized minorities, have a similar tradition of using satire and other forms of comedy and humor to resist dominant conditions.